



THE INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

GOVERNANCE OF ILLINOIS HIGHER EDUCATION 1945-74

Boyd R. Keenan

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

378.1

K251g

I.H.S.



3381
62518

and ...

CONTENTS

Foreword	v
Preface	vii
I. Governance of Illinois Higher Education, 1945-65	3
II. A System of Systems Conceived in Master Plan--Phase II	17
III. Master Plan--Phase II Implemented	24
IV. Committee N and Alternatives for Governance	34
V. Committee N and Governance of Chicago Circle and Edwardsville	49
VI. Governance Since 1971 Committee N Recommendations	63
VII. Impact of Recent Developments on Governance for Master Plan--Phase IV	86
Appendices	95

FOREWORD

The governance of public higher education has always been a complex and controversial issue. In Illinois the present governance structures came into existence principally during the 1960s when the state began master planning for higher education. Decisions involved many actors in the state: the governor, the legislature, the Board of Higher Education, the public colleges and universities and their lay boards of directors.

The fourth phase of the Illinois Master Plan for Higher Education is now underway, and governance is to be a topic on the agenda. The scene has changed dramatically from the prosperous sixties; today, budgets are tight and enrollments stabilizing. Those concerned with governance must examine the present system carefully to determine its usefulness for the future.

To help in the assessment Professor Boyd Keenan has undertaken this study of the development of governance structures in Illinois since World War II. Professor Keenan is uniquely qualified for this task. He has long been a student of higher education and was a participant-observer during the formulation of the third master plan. He has also been examining the very complex governance arrangements in Indiana.

In accord with its charge to stimulate discussion on important public issues, the Institute of Government and Public Affairs is pleased to publish this study. Like all works published by the Institute, this study is entirely the responsibility of the author; the judgments are his as are any errors in fact or interpretation.

Samuel K. Gove
Director

PREFACE

Growth in American postsecondary education -- as measured by ordinary criteria -- undoubtedly is at its lowest rate since World War II. To many of us involved in this sector of education, it appears paradoxical that the "knowledge" institutions of society are being pruned at a time when unprecedented problems of a technological society impact with increasing intensity.

At this writing, political and philosophical factors associated with this condition are being debated in various arenas. Prominent in these discussions is the long-argued question of the role of state systems of higher education within our broad federal government. At a time when virtually all problems are national in scope, even the wisdom of maintaining widely diverse and distinct state systems of higher education is being challenged by some.

In the midst of this debate, the state remains the major unit for planning and for delivering services. Problems of managing higher education in the new era of scarcity -- as opposed to the period of relative plenty during the quarter century following World War II -- must be met in large measure by the states themselves during the foreseeable future. And though the states have many problems in common, each must respond out of its own history. The dimensions of these responses will be broad, encompassing such issues as educational philosophy, financing, internal management, and governance at both institutional and statewide levels.

In March of 1974 it became evident once again that the question of the governance of public colleges and universities would soon become a topic of discussion in Illinois. On March 12, Cameron West, the executive director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, announced the need to "update" the state's master plan for higher education. Near the top of a list of issues which West said deserved attention was "an assessment of the system of governance." The study which you now hold was conceived as an aid to those in Illinois who may be called upon to take part in this assessment.

College and university communities in general are suspicious of discussions on governance. Their spokesmen often argue that structure is largely irrelevant and that educational quality bears little relationship to the specific governance forms which have been devised. Though I disagree with this view, there is no intent to argue that point in this paper. Rather, a chief purpose of the study is to examine the social and political forces which have produced the existing governance system in Illinois and to identify those forces likely to be present in future discussions.

The usual admission by an author of total responsibility for opinions expressed in a research effort requires expansion here. An endeavor by a

faculty member of a particular university likely to be affected by any modification in governance arrangements is properly suspect. Thus I should emphasize that biases and failures in this study are mine alone. Further, I should note that the independence of the enterprise extends back to its conception. The project was proposed by me as a staff member of the Institute of Government and Public Affairs of the University of Illinois.

After approving my request for released time to prepare this study, the responsible University of Illinois officials made no attempt to influence the analysis or conclusions. I should express particular gratitude to Professor Samuel Gove, director of the Institute of Government and Public Affairs (in which I hold a part-time appointment), and Dr. Barry Munitz, Vice-President for Academic Development and Coordination, both of whom approved my released time and encouraged me to pursue the topic.

In the jargon of the social scientists, the study might be characterized as an exercise in "participant-observation." While on leave from the university during the 1970-71 academic year to serve as deputy director for program planning of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, I had the responsibility of serving as chief of staff to Committee N, a statewide panel examining higher education governance patterns. The opportunity to work closely during this period with BHE Executive Director James B. Holderman, Committee N Chairman James C. Worthy, and other committee members represented a valuable experience for a political scientist from academia.

Though I am indebted to Holderman, Worthy, Committee N members, and others for making the problems of governance "come alive," my interpretations are independent of their views. Intellectually, I owe much to Professor Gove, a specialist himself in Illinois state government, who in his characteristically helpful style shared many of his insights and cautioned me -- only partially successfully -- against drawing certain conclusions. A similar word of gratitude is due Penny Thornbrugh, research assistant in the Office of the Vice-President for Planning and Resource Allocation and former BHE staff member, who was invaluable in the task of tracing the significant events in postsecondary education since World War II. A major debt is due Ms. Ashley Nugent of the staff of the Institute of Government and Public Affairs for assistance in editing that went far beyond the usual editing task in providing more coherence for the total paper. Florence Edmison typed the final draft for camera-ready printing.

Finally, I am grateful to a host of unnamed faculty, administrators, and government leaders who have given of their time to educate me, at least partially, to the intricacies of Illinois public college and university governance.

Boyd Keenan
September 15, 1974

GOVERNANCE OF ILLINOIS HIGHER EDUCATION, 1945-74

Chapter I

GOVERNANCE OF ILLINOIS HIGHER EDUCATION, 1945-65

Announcement by Illinois Board of Higher Education Executive Director Cameron West on March 12, 1974, that "an assessment of the system of governance" would be included in an updating of the state's master plan for higher education pricked sensitive nerves throughout the higher education community.¹ Since the end of World War II, the question of lay board control over public colleges and universities has been one of those usually dormant but potentially explosive subjects that many observers expect sooner or later to reach a top spot on the agenda of Illinois state government.

Director West noted that governance would become an issue as the Board of Higher Education (BHE) began the process of developing Phase IV of the state's master plan for higher education. The first two phases of the master plan -- completed in 1964 and 1966 -- had been prepared in a time of rapid expansion. Governance of the state's institutions of higher learning was examined, but in a time of relative plenty, the architects of the master plan had not found it necessary to concentrate heavily on this aspect of the operation of colleges and universities.

BHE leaders who designed the third phase of the master plan -- approved by the entire board in 1971 -- labored at a time when resources were already becoming less plentiful. They attempted to insert the matter of governance into the planning procedure rather late in the process. When a complex set of controversies developed around governance, the full BHE membership decided to approve a Phase III document which virtually ignored the matter.

If the BHE does undertake a genuine assessment of the state's governance of higher education, the effort will mark the end of a long moratorium on a multifaceted controversy with potential for affecting every public college and university in Illinois. More than three years have passed since a prestigious, blue ribbon committee on governance -- known as Committee N -- submitted a report to the BHE which challenged certain arrangements in the state's present organizational structure. For a number of complex reasons, contrary to most earlier practices, the BHE merely received the Committee N report in the spring of 1971 and did not discuss it. Over the past three years the document essentially has been buried. It has been widely held in the Illinois higher education community that the 1971 BHE leadership was unsympathetic to the recommendations made by Committee N and simply wished to delay indefinitely further consideration of the report's recommendations.

Thus, a great deal of significance was attached to Director West's March 12 announcement. Many college and university officers assumed that the moratorium had been lifted on discussion of problems identified by the Committee N report. Further, since previous BHE executive directors had emerged as advocates of particular governance arrangements, it was natural for many institutional leaders to assume that West would eventually either support the existing governance pattern or offer reforms. In any case, it was expected that the assessment process would be directed by the executive director who had stepped into the position in May of 1973.

On July 23, 1974, BHE Chairman Donald Prince announced that West was resigning as executive director to return to North Carolina, barely fourteen months after assuming the position. Prince indicated that West would leave the Illinois post in mid-October of 1974. Until his departure, the incumbent would be a "lame duck" director, and it would be difficult for him to provide leadership in any governance assessment included in the early planning for Phase IV.

The successor to West and the staff that he assembles will be required to review hurriedly the recent history of governance matters. This document may be of some help to the new executive director of the BHE as well as to other educators and laymen who must continue the assessment which West announced in March.

Concepts Defined

Such concepts as coordination, governance, and administration are difficult to define. Yet the literature on Illinois public higher education rests heavily upon differentiations made between these functions. And an attempt at clarity is desirable.

In Illinois, the term "coordination" is said generally to embrace statewide master planning, financial planning, determination of institutional scope and mission, and program review and approval.

By definitions agreed to by most institutional officers, these functions are concentrated in the Illinois Board of Higher Education. (Probably the function about which there would be the most controversy is determination of institutional scope and mission. Some would argue that the statute creating the BHE does not clearly assign it such a function.)

In the nationwide literature on public higher education, the Illinois BHE is most often described as a planning and coordinating board.

The line dividing coordination from governance is a thin one and in many respects vague and indistinct. Yet there is virtual agreement that the primary governance function is concentrated in those bodies known as boards of trustees. Simply defined, their responsibilities are to oversee the total management of colleges and universities. In Illinois, the four governing boards for senior institutions are the University of Illinois Board of Trustees, the Southern Illinois Board of Trustees, the Board of Regents, and the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities. There are thirty-eight governing boards for junior and/or community colleges.

Because the boundaries between the two roles are imprecise, there are frequent occasions for misunderstandings and conflict. Since the BHE's creation in 1961, the governing boards have often been concerned that actions of this agency and its staff frequently seem to invade the area of governance. In turn, the BHE and its staff often feel frustrated by resistance to what they view as their legitimate functions of coordination.

Administration, as opposed to governance, is usually viewed as the day-to-day internal management of institutional matters. In Illinois, administration occurs both at the campus level and at system levels where some campuses are clustered together. The function of administration is lodged in officers known as presidents and chancellors.

At the senior institutional level, administration is carried on under the following governing boards:

Board of Trustees, University of Illinois

Urbana-Champaign Campus
Chicago Circle Campus
Medical Center Campus (Chicago)

Board of Trustees, Southern Illinois University

Carbondale Campus (with medical campus in Springfield)
Edwardsville Campus

Board of Regents

Northern Illinois University
Illinois State University
Sangamon State University

Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities

Eastern Illinois University
Western Illinois University
Northeastern Illinois State University
Chicago State University
Governors State University

Most of the thirty-eight community and/or junior college district governing boards have only one campus which they oversee. But some districts do have multicampus systems, bringing the campus total for these community colleges to forty-eight.

Need for Historical Perspective

As this brief outline suggests, the present governing structure of Illinois postsecondary education is extremely complex. Out-of-state educators find it difficult to understand what university officers describe as a "system of systems." Any Illinois layman or any professional educator newly arrived in the state, wishing to develop a clear picture of the operation of this system, must initially take a historical perspective.

Aiding in the attempt to gain such a perspective is an understanding of the growth rate in dollars expended and in students enrolled in Illinois public higher education since 1945. It is always hazardous to attach undue significance to such aggregate data when definitions are imprecise, but three general tables are presented here for the purpose of providing rough notions of developments since 1945.

Illinois Higher Education After The War

Many social commentators have suggested that the year 1945 should really be labeled as "year one" in contemporary affairs. With mankind's entrance into the nuclear age and the ending of World War II during that year a new era was indeed begun. The logical beginning for an assessment of Illinois higher education governance would be 1945.

The fall of 1945 found Illinois with two distinct statewide public higher education "systems." These were: (1) the University of Illinois, consisting of its Urbana-Champaign campus and the medical complex in Chicago, both governed by the University's own Board of Trustees; and (2) five institutions governed by the Teachers College Board. These institutions, as they were formally named in 1945, were Northern Illinois State College at DeKalb, Eastern Illinois State Teachers College at Charleston, Western Illinois State Teachers College at Macomb, Illinois State Normal University at Normal and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. The significance of these confusing differences in names will be discussed later.

Table I

ILLINOIS STATE DOLLARS EXPENDED FOR POSTSECONDARY
EDUCATION OPERATING BUDGETS, 1945-73

Fiscal Year	Amount Expended (in millions)
1945	\$13.0
1950	44.7
1955	51.8
1960	94.6
1965	167.6
1970	427.8
1971	500.7
1972	525.0
1973	574.6
1974*	623.7
1975*	679.8

*Based on appropriations approved by the General Assembly and the governor. Expenditure data for these fiscal years are not yet available.

Sources: FY1945-55 information as reported in Illinois State Budgets and Illinois Department of Finance reports for those years. FY1960-75 information provided by Board of Higher Education staff.

Table II

ILLINOIS STATE DOLLARS EXPENDED FOR POSTSECONDARY
EDUCATION CAPITAL BUDGETS, 1945-73

Fiscal Year	Amount Expended (in millions)*
1945	\$ 1.3
1950	17.0
1955	8.8
1960	3.9
1965	21.8
1970	59.6
1971	74.5
1972	60.6
1973	57.8
1974**	54.5
1975**	36.1

* Includes projects funded by University Building Funds (bonds and interest), and Illinois Building Authority rentals, but does not include projects financed by Illinois Building Authority.

** Based on appropriations and reappropriations approved by the General Assembly and the governor. Expenditure data for these fiscal years are not yet available.

Sources: FY1945-55 information as reported in Illinois State Budgets and Illinois Department of Finance Reports for those years. FY1960-75 information provided by Board of Higher Education staff.

Table III

OPENING FALL ENROLLMENTS, ILLINOIS PUBLIC
INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 1945-73

Year	On-Campus Headcount	Full-Time Equivalent
1945	20,766	18,274*
1950	45,420	39,061*
1955	62,671	52,644*
1960	96,246	78,922*
1965	168,657	135,612
1970	307,258	242,450
1971	326,816	256,001
1972	337,535	258,609
1973	345,155	258,052

*Estimated.

Source: University of Illinois, Bureau of Institutional Research.

Growth of colleges and universities, which so graphically characterized the development of public higher education around the country for the first two decades after World War II, soon resulted in organizational changes in Illinois. In 1949, the General Assembly removed Southern Illinois University (SIU) from the jurisdiction of the Teachers College Board, establishing the SIU Board of Trustees as an independent agency.

Another symptom of growth was action by the General Assembly in 1951 to make the Teachers College Board itself an independent agency. The board, created in 1917 to replace separate boards for each institution, was a part of the Illinois Department of Registration and Education until the 1951 legislative action. Between 1917 and 1951, the institutions, in effect, had been under the direction of the Department of Registration and Education, with its departmental director serving as chairman of the Teachers College Board.

Though preoccupation with the first ten or fifteen years after the end of World War II would serve no major purpose here, at least some familiarity with certain dynamics of that period are essential to an understanding of the state system in 1974. Carl Grafton, a student of public higher education and a political scientist, cites the Illinois system from 1950 to 1960 as "a perfect example of a mutual adjustment system."² By this he meant, in part, that no central coordinating agency existed other than the General Assembly itself. Three governing boards (the University of Illinois Board, the Southern Illinois University Board, and the Teachers College Board) representing six institutions fended for themselves in the governmental arena.

Since the later discussion deals so heavily with the relationships existing between governing boards and the campuses and/or institutions which are managed by them, a 1957 change in Northern's formal name to make the institution a "university" may provide some notion of broad attitudes. While legislators from the DeKalb area were pressing for the change, the Teachers College Board passed a resolution in opposition to this legislation. In spite of the opposition the name change was approved by the General Assembly in 1957. Writing shortly after passage of this legislation, Samuel Gove captured something of the inconsistency of the times:

It would seem that the change in name, indicating a broadened educational program, was one that affected fundamental policy and that the governing board should have initiated the action. Although name changes have been suggested for the Teachers College Board itself, there has been no agreement and we now have the strange situation of a Teachers College Board governing four universities, three of which have curricula broader than teacher education. Legislative decisions on the institution name change question, like those made in controversies previously mentioned, did not involve partisan divisions.³

The Soviet launching of Sputnik in the fall of 1957 moved colleges and universities into a new era. Federal dollars became more plentiful, and the increased popularity of science and engineering put new pressures on the General Assembly to fund new programs at virtually all the state's campuses. In the late fifties sharp conflicts intensified between legislators who had long sought to protect the interests of the University of Illinois and Southern Illinois University.

The debate climaxed over the proposed development of an engineering degree curriculum at SIU. Legislation passed in 1943 had set a prohibition on SIU engineering degree programs, as well as "professional courses culminating in degrees" in law, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, and agriculture. Debate resulting from attempts by the president of SIU and his supporters in the General Assembly to lift this programmatic ban was only one of the dramatic manifestations of increasing conflict over higher education programs and allocations.

In an effort to handle these kinds of controversies more effectively, the General Assembly in 1957 voted to establish the Commission of Higher Education, and in July of that year Governor William Stratton signed the measure into law.⁴ Though the new commission was admittedly a study commission with little actual authority, its creation marked the real beginning of a movement to develop a statewide coordinating body for higher education. Two years later, legislators amended the basic enabling act, directing the commission "to recommend to the General Assembly, not later than April 1, 1961, a plan for the unified administration of all the State-controlled institutions of higher education" in Illinois.⁵

The commission became a center of controversy as it advocated and promoted a strong central coordinating board. Late in 1960, the commission issued a formal report calling for such a board. Two provisions of the report were particularly obnoxious to college and university leaders. The first was the prohibition of membership on the board of more than one individual who had been enrolled in a given undergraduate institution. The second was the prohibition of official communications between members of the General Assembly and university officials.

All six existing state institutions opposed the commission's plan. The University of Illinois in particular charged it as going far beyond mere coordination. U of I officials claimed the plan involved an improper delegation of legislative authority and a dangerous restriction on the universities.

Pertinent to later discussions in this paper is the fact that Otto Kerner, a Democrat, defeated William Stratton, a Republican, in the November 1960 election for governor. In his inaugural address in January 1961, Kerner recommended the formation of a coordinating board stronger than that acceptable to the institutions but less powerful than that advocated by the commission. On April 6 Governor Kerner's specific proposals were included in a bill introduced by leadership in the Illinois

Senate.⁶ In testimony strikingly similar to arguments made in recent years, the chairman of the SIU Board of Trustees declared:

We have...sometimes wondered why our present governing boards are in some quarters regarded as having failed or as being on trial. They have only done what they are supposed to do....

Under its present system of governing boards...Illinois has one of the nation's greatest state universities, one of its most noted regional universities, and an outstanding group of universities emphasizing teacher education. Just what is unhappy about this situation? Why is there any need for a kind of change which might reduce to mediocrity one or more of these institutions?⁷

In its three-year existence, the commission had drawn upon critical analyses which had been made of the Illinois system since 1945. Commission members and legislators seeking a strong coordinating agency used several arguments in support of such a unit.

The charge of needless program duplication has been used in virtually all states that have moved toward strong coordinating boards or single governing boards. In a large industrial state such as Illinois, there obviously must be some duplication, even at the graduate level, and it was difficult for advocates of a strong coordinating board in 1961 actually to identify and define wasteful duplication.

More effective was the argument that the existing institutions had not developed urban and technical-vocational programs. As of 1961 public universities did not exist in the cities of Chicago or Springfield and few two-year, technical-vocational programs existed anywhere in Illinois.

Policy variations among institutions were sources of irritation. Diverse admission and transfer policies around the state brought protests from legislators, who were being pressured by their constituents to seek uniformities for the sake of students. Faculty and staff salary differentials also presented problems, but the political impact was much smaller, of course, and legislators did not feel the pressure as intensely on this matter.

The criticism was made that new academic programs at state colleges and universities were subjected to the vagaries of state politics. An example cited by the supporters of SIU was the prohibition on engineering degree offerings at Carbondale. The open conflict in Springfield which sometimes had arisen between representatives of the U of I and SIU strengthened the hand of those who marshalled this argument.

Writing in 1974, it is difficult to realize the prominence of the problem of selecting sites for new campuses. Expansion of facilities was occurring rapidly. Legislators admitted to lack of time and expertise in rational choices in this area. University and college officers had both more time and talent to evaluate data relating to this issue, but it was difficult for them to remain independent of their own special interests. Grafton has noted, in reviewing the need for a coordinating body in Illinois, that "the interest most frequently cited was...strong loyalty to the central campus."⁸ Thus, it was argued that a central state agency provided with time and expertise could rationally meet the challenge of selecting campus sites in keeping with the state's interest.

Many legislators and other knowledgeable citizens felt that the universities simply could not be trusted to manage the kind of expansion that seemed to be on the horizon in Illinois public higher education. Related to this argument was an uneasiness felt by some political scientists and management specialists that the lack of neatness and order in the Illinois system in 1961 called for a central planning unit.

Board of Higher Education Created

In the spring of 1961, Governor Kerner called a series of meetings with legislative leaders of both parties at which a compromise was reached. Bills reflecting these compromises were introduced in both the Senate and House on May 24 and passed with relative ease.⁹ Under the compromise, the new Board of Higher Education would consist of two members appointed by each of the three governing boards, eight public members appointed by the governor, and the superintendent of public instruction as ex officio member. The total was fifteen members.

The 1961 law assigns four major areas of responsibility to the BHE.

1. Preparation of "a master plan for the development, expansion, integration, coordination and efficient utilization...of higher education."¹⁰ This activity was to be a continuing one.
2. Approval of "any new unit of instruction, research or public service" mounted by any state institution.
3. Submission to the governor and the General Assembly of an analysis and recommendation of budget proposals which all public institutions earlier would transmit to the board.
4. Administration of federal programs which require monitoring and/or administration by a statewide agency.

The 1961 legislation requires -- and later amendments have not tampered with the provision -- that the governor appoint the BHE chairman. Kerner's choice for the chairmanship was Ben W. Heineman, Chicago businessman, who remained in the position until the inauguration of Richard B.

Ogilvie as governor in January of 1969. The statute also provides that the full board appoint a chief executive officer and other necessary staff.

As discussion below emphasizes, the position of executive staff director of the BHE has been critical from the beginning, and an understanding of the backgrounds and styles of individuals who have served in this position is important. Heineman and the first board organized following the new legislation selected Richard Browne of Normal as the first executive director. In addition to having headed the professional staff of the Teachers College Board, Browne was an alumnus of SIU and the U of I. He had taught at Illinois State University and for a time had served as acting president of Western Illinois University. Browne in turn recommended the appointment of Lyman Glenn, political scientist at Sacramento State College (now University), to the associate directorship. Glenn had recently become prominent in the coordinating field as a result of a book on the subject. In 1962 Browne and Glenn were faced with two immense tasks: initiating the first master plan and analyzing university budgets.

Phase I of Illinois Master Plan

This first effort in master planning soon became known as "Phase I." The first step in its preparation was the creation in 1962 of ten technical committees which, taken together, examined virtually every major problem of Illinois higher education. The committees were made up of both educators and private citizens. According to Carl Grafton, "the selection of committee personnel was managed completely by Browne and Glenn."¹¹ The committees met approximately once a month from the time of their creation to the time of their last meetings in December of 1963. The same writer states that Browne and Glenn's "attempts to influence the outcome of the committee's deliberations were low-keyed and subtle."¹²

Final drafts of the technical committees' reports were submitted to the three BHE advisory committees existing at that time: the Citizens Advisory Committee, the Faculty Advisory Committee, and the Presidents Advisory Committee. Browne and Glenn submitted a "Provisional Master Plan" to the BHE in March of 1964. Several thousand copies of this draft were distributed throughout the state and then a series of open public hearings were held. Later in the year the master plan was approved by the entire board.

Such brief treatment of the development of the first phase of the master plan -- formally titled "A Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois" -- should not be construed as downgrading its importance as a foundation for later developments. However, it does not have the relevance to the issue of governance of later master planning efforts. The major significance of the first master plan for governance was the recommendation of the establishment of a new statewide junior college board. Such a board was created by the 1965 General Assembly, its members were appointed in August of 1965, and the board first met on September 4, 1965.¹³

Summary of Early History

What is to be said, then, of the importance of developments from 1945 to 1965 for the dilemma which faces Illinois public higher education leaders in 1974? Very little. One who agonizes through the record of these years is likely to be disappointed in its relevance for 1974. The times are different, and several sets of leaders at the statewide system and campus levels have come and gone. Many persons with whom I have talked during the preparation of this study have argued that the only lasting factor in public higher education is the nature of the Illinois General Assembly.

Conventional wisdom has suggested that the Illinois legislature is somehow different from similar bodies in other states. We shall see later in this report that attitudes attributed to Cameron West in connection with his recent resignation from the BHE directorship seem to support this view of the "uniqueness" of Illinois legislators. However, neither this study nor scores of others like it have been able definitely to affirm this idea.

The major challenge remaining before me is that of presenting a narrative to aid those who must make very difficult decisions. A new planning process must begin for those professionals and laymen who will be assigned the task of assessing the governance situation. The period at which they must look most closely for hints as to why problems have emerged in governance arrangements probably begins in 1965 when developments were initiated which resulted in what is known as the "system of systems."

Footnotes

1. In addition to an oral presentation by Cameron West at the Board of Higher Education meeting on March 12, 1974, West distributed "Executive Director's Report #118 -- Master Planning." This report is available from BHE offices in Springfield. Also see "Qualitative Improvements Concern Master Plan -- Phase IV," Journal of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, March 1974.
2. Carl T. Grafton, "A Study of the Coordination of the Universities of Indiana and Illinois," (Ph.D. diss. Purdue University, 1970), p. 49. A particular expression of gratitude is due Professor Grafton, who is now a member of the political science faculty at the University of Houston. He began the Ph.D. dissertation cited above under my direction at Purdue University in 1966. When I left that institution in 1967, he continued research on the same topic under the direction of Professor Don Kash. In many unexpected ways, Professor Grafton's manuscript and his later publication have been extremely helpful to me in reconstructing the complex activities in Illinois during the period covered by his research.
3. Samuel K. Gove, "State Politics and Public Higher Education," Chapter VIII in Public Higher Education in Illinois (Staff Report to the Committee to Recommend a State Plan for Public Higher Education, Illinois Joint Council on Higher Education, Springfield, 1961), p. 123.
4. Senate Bill 547, 70th General Assembly, signed by Governor William G. Stratton, July 9, 1957.
5. House Bill 527.
6. Senate Bill 353.
7. Statement of John Page Wham, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Southern Illinois University, before the Senate Education Committee of the Illinois General Assembly, April 12, 1961.
8. Grafton, "Coordination of the Universities," p. 123.
9. Ill. Rev. Stats. (1961), Ch. 144, sec. 191.
10. Ibid.
11. Grafton, "Coordination of the Universities," p. 132.
12. Ibid., p. 134.
13. For a thorough discussion of this period see Richard G. Browne, The Illinois Master Plan (Normal, Ill., September 30, 1966).

Chapter II

A SYSTEM OF SYSTEMS CONCEIVED IN MASTER PLAN-PHASE II

The signing on July 15, 1965, by Governor Kerner of a series of twenty-seven bills, enacting into law the chief provisions of the master plan for Illinois higher education, climaxed a massive effort by the BHE and the college and university community.

Yet with problems of growth that are difficult to imagine by 1974 standards, the BHE began almost immediately to set the stage for the preparation of Phase II of the master plan. As in the planning for the original master plan, the BHE initiated the new efforts by appointing five technical committees. One of these, Committee N, dealt specifically with governance. It was appointed in December 1965, with James C. Worthy of Chicago selected as chairman.

Few, if any, individuals have affected the statewide governance arrangements of Illinois public colleges and universities more than Worthy. An assistant U.S. secretary of commerce in the Eisenhower administration (1953-55), Worthy had returned to Chicago to become vice-president of Sears, Roebuck & Company in 1956. In 1962 he left Sears to become a partner in the national management consulting firm of Cresap, McCormick & Paget, with offices in Chicago. He was associated with this firm when appointed to chair Committee N late in 1965. The prominence of this corporation in providing management counsel to several institutions in Illinois adds a special dimension to Worthy's own activities in numerous "citizen" roles.

Role of First Committee N

Virtually all of Chapter V will be devoted to a second Committee N, also chaired by Worthy, which was active in 1970-71. Thus, it would be desirable for the reader to become accustomed early to the distinction between the Committee N of 1965-66, and the later panel of 1970-71.

Unlike the second Committee N, which was widely known as a blue ribbon citizens' group (including two former governors), the Committee N appointed in December of 1965 included four representatives of Illinois public institutions. They were: Hobart Heller, vice-president, Eastern Illinois University; Robert W. MacVicar, vice-president for Academic Affairs, Southern Illinois University; Russell N. Sullivan, dean of the College of Law, University of Illinois; and R. G. Whitsell, associate dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Northern Illinois University. The "citizen" members -- in addition to Worthy -- were Carlyle Anderson of Wyckoff-Anderson; James Broman, manager, Education Department, Illinois State Chamber of Commerce; Ralph Johns, Haskins & Sells; and William McKnight, publisher, Bloomington.

Thus, the committee consisted of five noninstitutional members, and four representatives of the colleges and universities.

The charge given Chairman Worthy and his committee by the BHE is reproduced in full in Appendix A. Although space does not permit a description of the inner workings of the committee, the willingness of the institutional members to make compromises in their final recommendations -- whether wise policy or not -- is a historical point that should not be overlooked.

On June 1, 1966, Committee N submitted its report to the BHE. "Most important of the recommendations of Committee N were those relating to establishing what was termed a 'system of systems'."¹ Each of five systems was differentially described by the kinds and levels of programs which each campus within the respective system would offer. These were:

1. Fully Developed, Multipurpose University. The fully developed, complex, multipurpose university. This type of institution offers work, usually at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, in most of the recognized fields of knowledge, has a diversity of professional schools, and is extensively involved in research and public service (University of Illinois).
2. Rapidly Developing Multipurpose University. The rapidly developing, complex, multipurpose university. This type of institution retains some probative restrictions related to geography, advanced programs, and typological priorities (Southern Illinois University).
3. Liberal Arts University. The "liberal arts" university. This type of institution is one having a program of graduate education, leading to the doctorate in a significant number of fields, but whose breadth of offerings is restricted to the liberal arts and sciences and other related undergraduate programs, with only a limited number of associated graduate professional schools, usually education or business administration (Northern Illinois University and Illinois State University).
4. State Universities and Colleges. This type of institution has a more limited scope of offerings, usually does not have professional schools except in the field of teacher education, and offers the doctorate in only a very limited number of fields or not at all.
5. Junior/Community Colleges. This type of institution offers college transfer, adult education, and occupational curriculums of up to two years' duration for all students capable of profiting from such programs.²

In support of the "system-of-systems" concept based on typology, Committee N recommended that a new board, the Board of Regents, be created to govern the liberal arts universities. The committee also recommended that new campuses be assigned to the appropriate governing board within the system of systems according to typology, balance among the systems, and to a lesser extent, geographical consideration.³ All new campuses were to be "free-standing."⁴ The concept of a free-standing campus, though its meaning was challenged from the beginning, centered around the notion that a chief executive would manage internal campus affairs without interference from a central system office. A free-standing campus would differ from a branch campus.

From the submission of the report in June of 1966 to the present, criticism has come from various sectors that the notion of a system of systems and a preoccupation with balance among the systems rely too heavily upon political (but generally nonpartisan) factors. Some members of Committee N would concede, in private, that statewide political forces were considered in reaching these recommendations. As one member (no longer associated with Illinois affairs) put it to me: "This idea might not be best in an ideal, abstract setting, but we had to consider the real world of Illinois politics."

The continuing advisory bodies serving the BHE responded to the system of systems notion in a variety of ways.

The Presidents Advisory Committee, composed of the presidents of Illinois public colleges and universities, passed two resolutions. One opposed the creation of any new governing boards. The second noted that "the committee favors the principle of typology as the basis of determining what institutions shall be under what board."

The Faculty Advisory Committee endorsed the system of systems and the notion of free-standing campuses but did not comment at all on the Board of Regents. This body's response also indicated that a majority agreed with Committee N on the "grouping of institutions" but accepted the criterion of free-standing campuses "as tentative, open-ended."

A third advisory panel, the Citizens Advisory Committee, essentially accepted the entire Committee N report. It endorsed the system-of-systems concept, the new Board of Regents, and the idea that new campuses be free-standing, and it asserted that the principal consideration for assigning campuses to these systems should be the role and function of the individual educational institutions.

Phase II Recommendations

In 1966, Lyman Glenny had replaced Richard Browne as BHE executive director, and Glenny's staff recommendations to the board on Master Plan -- Phase II reflected the sentiments of Committee N. When Glenny made the formal staff recommendations for Master Plan -- Phase II to the BHE on

December 5, 1966, the essential points from Committee N were included. As discussed below, controversy still rages among "oldtimers" as to whether the board itself formally accepted the notion of the system of systems. MP-II recommendations approved by the full board never used the phrase "system of systems," but discussion in the final Phase II report does indeed use the wording and ideas from the Committee N report. It states:

The heart of the plan is to create a "system of systems." It proposes that the public higher education community be subdivided into systems which, individually, have a functional unity and cohesion....

Each governing board should be responsible for a particular type or kind of education...a manifest diversity should differentiate each system from others.⁵

Thus, Master Plan -- Phase II recommended recognition of the five board systems proposed by Committee N (Rec. 18), the creation of the new Board of Regents (Rec. 17), and the use of the concept of free-standing campuses (Rec. 20). It suggested in Recommendation 19 that the Board of Higher Education assign newly-authorized colleges to one of the university governing boards.

Among other items relating to the establishment of new institutions, Recommendation 4 of MP-II provides that the board:

determine the general role and function of the institution most suited to serve the needs of the area in which it is located.

- 1) Designate the levels of instruction to be offered by the institution in order to support its role and function...and

Assign governance and further development of the institution to an appropriate public university governing board.⁶

Again, a point of contention over the past nine years within the Illinois public higher education community has been the degree to which the BHE subscribed to the system-of-systems concept when it approved MP-II and similarly just how committed legislators were to the notion when they later passed Board of Regents legislation. In a paper released by the BHE staff on November 6, 1967, the point is made that both the board and the General Assembly were well aware of the creation of a system of systems:

During Board consideration and action on Phase II several staff recommendations in relation to internal governance and language supporting them in the "Comment" section were deleted. No suggestion was made by the Board that the

"Comment" and the recommendations cited above be deleted.

The typology and the "system of systems" concepts were discussed before the legislative leaders in reviewing proposed legislation for the new Board of Regents in a series of meetings in the Governor's office. The legislative leadership endorsed the proposed Board of Regents legislation and it has become law.⁷

Indeed, the Illinois General Assembly did establish the Board of Regents in 1967 -- through the Regency Universities Act -- and the governing system became effective on July 1, 1967.⁸ And, in accordance with recommendations of both Committee N and the BHE itself, the governance of Northern Illinois University and Illinois State University was shifted from the Board of Governors to the new Board of Regents on that date.

A simple chronology of this period in the history of Illinois public higher education fails to capture the intensity of feelings on the de facto creation of the system of systems and the cross-stitching of this issue to the proposals of governance of new institutions being put forward by a host of state agencies and advisory panels. Some background is necessary on the appearance of a new kind of institution, the senior university.

Since its inception in 1961, the BHE had consistently worked to expand the availability of public higher education for increasing numbers of students. A central thrust of board action had been the creation of new commuter institutions in the most densely populated areas of the state. In addition, the initial master plan proposed measures which encouraged the expansion of junior colleges throughout the state. These proposals, as embodied in legislation by the General Assembly in 1965, had set up incentives for the creation of new local junior college districts. Subsequently, under the leadership of the Illinois Junior College Board, there had been phenomenal growth in these two-year community-oriented institutions.

During Master Plan -- Phase II, the BHE carried the concept of two-year commuter colleges one step further to urban senior universities. The idea was that these senior institutions would offer work at the junior and senior undergraduate levels and at the graduate level leading to a master's degree only. The senior universities would thus function in a complementary relationship with the rapidly growing junior college segment. Several master plan technical committees concurred with this plan. On July 1, 1966, Committee M (Demography and Location) recommended immediate creation of four new institutions aimed primarily toward service to potential concentrations of student populations. The Committee M report states:

The Committee was in complete agreement that first consideration be given to new commuter senior colleges in the Chicago area.⁹

The Citizens Advisory Committee called for establishment of three new senior college campuses as soon as possible, two in the Chicago area and one in Springfield. The Faculty Advisory Committee proposed three new four-year colleges in the Chicago area and one senior college in the Springfield area.

When these recommendations reached the BHE, it reemphasized its policy of recommending commuter institutions rather than residential colleges to accommodate future enrollments. In Master Plan -- Phase II the BHE requested that the state begin in 1967 to plan for additional commuter colleges in the Chicago metropolitan area and in the Springfield area. The board further proposed that the legislature authorize funds to commence the planning and development of these new institutions.

As a result of these efforts, the 75th Illinois General Assembly -- the same session which approved the Regency Universities Act -- passed Senate Bill 955, which Governor Kerner signed into law on July 14, 1967. This bill contained the following provisions in relation to the planning and development of new state-supported senior institutions:

- 1) A sum of \$3,000,000 is appropriated for campus planning, site acquisition, and architectural services.
- 2) No portion of the appropriation can be expended for site development or construction of physical facilities.
- 3) Upon recommendation of the Board of Higher Education, and the advice of a legislative committee comprised of the majority and minority leaders of both houses, the Governor shall designate the amount, if any, that each university governing board may expend for the new senior institutions, one to be planned in the Chicago Metropolitan Area and the other in the Springfield area.¹⁰

Footnotes

1. Illinois Board of Higher Education, "Master Plan Statements Concerning Criteria on Governance," a paper released by the board on November 6, 1967.
2. Ibid.
3. Illinois, Board of Higher Education, Report of Master Plan Committee N -- Governing Structure (Springfield, 1966), p. 18.
4. Ibid., p. 19.
5. Illinois, Board of Higher Education, Master Plan -- Phase II (Springfield, December 1966), p. 56.
6. Ibid.
7. Illinois, Board of Higher Education, "Master Plan Statements Concerning Criteria on Governance," a paper released by the board on November 6, 1967.
8. Ill. Rev. Stats. (1967) ch. 144, secs. 301-311.
9. Illinois, Board of Higher Education, Report of Committee N (1966), p. 2.
10. Senate Bill 955, 75th General Assembly.

Chapter III

MASTER PLAN -- PHASE II IMPLEMENTED

To meet the problems presented by the legislative directive to plan new institutions, the BHE established the "Special Committee on New Senior Institutions." It was an unprecedented move. The seven member board was to work with the staff to make recommendations to the full board on the function, general location, and initial governance of the two senior institutions.¹

In the interim between submission of the Committee N report on June 1, 1966, and the creation of the special committee on September 13, 1967, James Worthy had been appointed to the BHE by Governor Kerner. When BHE Chairman Heineman appointed the special committee, he chose Worthy to chair the panel. The months between the date of the appointment of the special committee and the submission of its report to Heineman on December 22, 1967, have been described by many as the most controversial period in Illinois public higher education.

Governance of Proposed Springfield Institution

Much of the controversy arose from the desire of the University of Illinois to obtain governance authority over the new institution to be established in Springfield. On October 16, 1967, the university submitted a document, "Proposal for the Establishment by the University of Illinois of a New Institution of Higher Education in Springfield," to the BHE. This 12-page statement detailed the advantages to be obtained, in the opinion of the university administration, from its governance of the campus.

The comments under a section entitled "Benefits from the University's Organizational Structure," are most pertinent for this paper. According to these comments, the administrative organization of the university "has recently been changed so that its several campuses are now educationally autonomous with a chancellor as the chief executive officer."² The statement further declared that "if the University were assigned the task of developing the new institution in Springfield, a chancellor would be appointed and other appropriate administrative officers selected without any administrative control from the other campuses."³

The direct entry of the University of Illinois into the controversy over governance of the Springfield campus brought responses from various sources. Aside from some built-in opposition from other institutions, a few sectors within the University of Illinois system fought the proposal. Among these was the Executive Board of the Chicago Circle Federation of Teachers (Local 1627, American Federation of Teachers) which opposed the request of the university to govern both the new Springfield campus and the proposed new campus in the Chicago area:

The bid by the University of Illinois Board of Trustees to administer the new campuses was made without any consultation with faculty at this campus.

...no one seems to have bothered to ask the simple question; do the three University of Illinois faculties want the Board of Trustees to acquire additional responsibilities over and above those which they now have (even though the faculties clearly have an interest in the matter).

...we seriously question the competence of the Board of Trustees and administration to govern new campuses in view of their apparent inability or unwillingness at Chicago Circle campus.

...we feel that the new campuses should be autonomous, with governing boards whose composition adequately reflects the makeup of the population to be served by the campuses.⁴

As the Special Committee on New Senior Institutions continued its work, controversy increased as reports of deliberations indicated that BHE Executive Director Glennly was recommending governance in terms of such criteria as "instructional typology" and "balance among systems." University of Illinois President David D. Henry on November 4, 1967, sent a telegram to members of the special committee which declared:

The University of Illinois strongly objects to use of such criteria as not having sanction of the Board of Higher Education in Master Plan - Phase II and as not being in the interest of development of higher education in Illinois.

...we feel application of criterion of balance of systems would be to declare a policy of opposition to any additional campuses for University of Illinois.

...I am confident that many members of the General Assembly in authorizing establishment of new campuses did not understand that University of Illinois would be excluded from governance of the Springfield campus on the basis of Glennly's statement.⁵

Two days later, a formal document entitled "Special Committee Agreements" was issued by the office of the staff of the Board of Higher Education in Springfield. Its opening paragraph asserted:

This paper represents statements of general committee agreements which the Special Committee is now considering for recommendation to the Board of Higher Education.

The Committee will take final action on its recommendations on function, location and freestanding at its December 5th meeting. Governance will be considered at its December 18th meeting and at subsequent meetings if necessary.⁶

The subtle points of this document and other arguments made by Glenn and Henry in their 1967 presentations are relevant for discussions on governance that will precede MP-IV. Central in the controversy was the university's argument that such criteria as "institutional typology" and "balance among systems" did not have sanction of the BHE in its approval of MP-II. Is this contention true and, if so, how did Glenn and the members of the special committee meet it in their own paper, "Special Committee Agreements?"

Technically, it appears that Henry was correct in arguing that the criteria did not have BHE sanction in its approval of MP-II. In an introduction to the initial portion of Master Plan -- Phase II, this matter is clarified.⁷ The introduction describes in detail how staff proposals were discussed through several stages and how the total staff document was finally presented to the BHE at a meeting on December 5, 1966. Finally, according to the introduction, the board "approved all of the recommendations (italics mine) as they appear herein." However, "the comments (italics mine) remain the sole responsibility of the staff."⁸

The phrase system of systems is not mentioned in any recommendation. However, Recommendation 17 reads, in part:

A new governing board to be known as the "Board of Regency Universities" be authorized and created, and Northern Illinois University at DeKalb and Illinois State University at Normal be transferred from the jurisdiction of the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities to that of the Board of Regency Universities.⁹

In the following recommendation, there is mention of the "five systems of higher education" but the specific phrase "system of systems" is never used. The exact wording of Recommendation 18 follows:

All public-supported post-high school institutions in Illinois be governed and/or coordinated within the jurisdiction of five systems of higher education as follows:

- The University of Illinois System
- The Southern Illinois University System
- The Regency Universities System
- The State Colleges and Universities System
- The Illinois Junior College System

However, in the "comment" following these recommendations, there is a lengthy discussion of "A Plan for a System of Systems" (pp. 56-60). In a sense, both Henry and Glenny were correct in their arguments. It would seem that the lay leadership of the BHE would hardly have permitted the staff to publish its comment with such prominence if a majority of the board had serious objections. On the other hand, the record is clear that the BHE -- even to the present -- has not formally approved the concept of a system of systems or the notion of a balance among systems.

These questions of whether the BHE ever actually sanctioned the system of systems and whether the General Assembly ever recognized the concept were to plague all future relations between Glenny and the University of Illinois.

As for the special committee, it asserted that it had used the criteria suggested by Committee N, and apparently did not feel it necessary to point out the criteria were not endorsed by the BHE itself. On the matter of the General Assembly's awareness of the system of systems, the "Special Committee Agreements" included the following masterful exercise in ambiguity:

Because the legislature has implemented the Master Plan recommendation to create a "system of systems" among public higher institutions in Illinois by authorizing the formation of the new Board of Regents, the Committee believes that no additional governing boards should be created for senior public institutions in the foreseeable future.¹⁰

The paragraph implies that MP-II included a recommendation to create a system of systems, but our earlier discussion has shown this was not the case, at least technically. It is implied that action by the General Assembly in creating the Board of Regents somehow carried with it an endorsement of the system of systems and its accompanying criteria. In the "Addendum to the Report," the special committee returns again to the Committee N criteria:

A new institution should be assigned by the Board of Higher Education to the most appropriate state system (not institution) for development and governance. The criteria for allocation should include system typology, balance in and among systems and, to a lesser extent, geography.¹¹

Only four days after release of the "Special Committee Agreements," on November 10, 1967, President Henry presented a document to the University of Illinois Board of Trustees entitled "Comments Regarding the Status of Deliberations of the Board of Higher Education Special Committee on New Senior Institutions." As in previous and succeeding statements issued by U of I officials, the call for a definition and rationale for the concept of a balance of systems was prominent in President Henry's paper. Near the end of the document, Henry characterized the concept as "arbitrary and

educationally irrelevant."¹² The people of Illinois were entitled to know whether the University of Illinois was to be used in the program of expansion of new campuses -- as had been done in California, Wisconsin, New York, North Carolina, and Missouri -- or whether the university "was to be excluded from this use of its capabilities because of the 'balance of system' concept."¹³

New Campuses Assigned to Boards

On December 22, Special Committee Chairman Worthy submitted the committee's report to Chairman Heineman. To no one's surprise the committee voted to assign the South Cook County institution to the Board of Governors and the Springfield institution to the Board of Regents. In addition, the report urged the BHE to adopt the system-of-systems concept. "Each individual system has a functional unity and cohesion, manifested by responsibility for a particular type or kind of education," the report declared.¹⁴ In effect, the report suggested that the BHE accept the portions of the MP-II document which have been characterized as "comments." Within Recommendation 19 was the provision that "balance among the several systems" be considered a criterion for assigning a new institution to a governing board.

The report contained a lengthy section on "The Principle of 'Balance of Systems'" in which it was asserted that "there is an 'educational establishment' and that this establishment in its totality and in some of its parts wields great power."¹⁵ The point was also made that excessive concentration of power within higher education can be as great a danger as excessive concentration of power in government, business, or any other segment of society. The report contained "A Special Note on the University of Illinois" in which similar arguments were presented.

Response to the report was dramatic. Criticism came from the University of Illinois, which was certainly expected, but it came also from within the special committee itself. The depth of feeling on the matter of the system of systems is revealed in a presentation made at the next BHE meeting, on January 10, 1968, by Ray Page, superintendent of public instruction, ex officio member of the BHE, and member of the special committee. Page was particularly emphatic in his criticism of heavy reliance of the Special Committee on the earlier Committee N:

The report has much to say about the role and function of each system, especially as related to professional and graduate programs, and tries to set up definitions for the indefinite future. However, here again, the Committee did not discuss these definitions and the Committee N report, which they appear to be taken from, has never been adopted by this Board. All of this should be very carefully and fully discussed before this Board is asked to act.

Even if we accepted the definitions of systems, we would be hard put to understand them....Finally the various

comments about power trouble me a great deal. In my experience, this is the language of politics, not higher education. As I read it, the report is saying: all of the institutions are too ambitious, they do not have proper regard for the public welfare, and we have to keep our eye on them.¹⁶

It should be noted that Page had abstained from voting in special committee meetings on the grounds that he was an ex-officio member of certain governing boards.

At the same meeting, a formal statement was presented to the BHE by the University of Illinois. The statement was primarily concerned "with matters in the Report that go beyond the charge to the Special Committee to 'make recommendations to the Board on the function, the general location and the initial governance' of the two senior institutions."¹⁷ The university declared that the special committee's report "sets forth a philosophy of higher education...which would...seriously limit the University of Illinois in its future development and rigidly categorize the public universities of the State."¹⁸ Several of the recommendations, according to the university, represented revisions of the master plan. Further, the time was not right and the special report not the procedure for predetermining the governance of future higher educational institutions to be authorized by the state government. A strongly worded section opposed the report's coverage of "balance of systems." The following paragraph illustrates the emotional tone of university officials on the matter:

We vigorously take exception to the proposed intrusion of non-educational considerations into the decision-making of the Board of Higher Education, either as a matter of state policy or as an operating practice. The Committee's extended treatment of the "power" balances, and the proposed elevation of them to the level of officially adopted educational "guidelines", is professionally unsound. The objective in the planning of higher education should not be "balance" in this political sense. A "system of systems" created deliberately to set off one system against another is an inappropriate substitute for the evaluation of educational planning by educational merit.¹⁹

On February 6, Executive Director Glennly made public a detailed response to the University of Illinois statement. Answering what he termed "attacks" on the special committee's work, Glennly characterized the tone and "inaccuracies" of the university's statement as "unbefitting a great and scholarly institution."

Both the university statement and the response by Glennly should be required reading for those who find themselves involved in the examination of governance questions in the development of MP-IV. The documents show well how two respected educators, Henry and Glennly, had honestly interpreted

a set of events in radically different ways from their respective institutional perspectives.

System-of-Systems Question Avoided

A point-by-point description of the conflict would serve no purpose here, but arguments advanced by both parties will be utilized in other portions of this paper. Suffice it to say that the full board decided to accept certain portions of the special committee report, reject other sections, and reissue a separate report to become known as the "Board Report on New Senior Institutions." This report was adopted on February 6, 1968, with recommendations deleted which called for adoption of the system of systems and the utilization of a criterion based on balance among the systems. Remaining in the report were the recommendations that the Board of Governors assume governance authority over the new institution in the southern part of Cook County and that the Board of Regents control the new institution in the Springfield area.

On February 12, BHE Chairman Heineman transmitted the report to Governor Kerner and in his letter of transmittal recommended that \$750,000 and \$1,500,000 be released to the Board of Regents and Board of Governors, respectively, for initial planning. A year later, during the 1969 session of the Illinois General Assembly, operational and building funds were authorized for institutions to be known as Sangamon State University, Springfield, and Governors State, Park Forest. The founding bills were signed into law on July 17, 1969, by Governor Richard Ogilvie.

In the summer of 1969 certain institutional leaders -- notably those at the University of Illinois -- were still maintaining that the system of systems had not been sanctioned by the BHE or the General Assembly. By that time, however, the phrase had become a part of the nomenclature of Illinois public college and university administrators, and certain behavioral practices had confirmed the existence of a system of systems in fact, if not in sanctioned recognition by the BHE and the General Assembly. One such confirmation was sessions of system heads which were becoming more and more institutionalized by the summer of 1969. For both budget and program planning as well as for discussions of other broad problems, the group of executive officers of the systems was being convened by the BHE executive director.

At that time, the body included (1) the president of the University of Illinois, (2) the president of SIU, (3) the executive director of the Board of Regents, (4) the executive officer of the Board of Governors, and (5) the executive secretary of the Illinois Junior College Board. Just a few months later, a series of events within the SIU institution disrupted that system and the president resigned. As will be discussed in detail later, even during a transition period at SIU, when management of the institution was moving from a president to a chief of board staff, a temporary chairman of a university-wide administrative council sat with the other system heads.

Thus, although the BHE staff leadership -- principally Lyman Glenny -- had not succeeded in getting the concept of the system of systems formally written into law by 1969, it did in fact exist in terms of operational procedures.

Footnotes

1. Illinois, Board of Higher Education, Minutes, September 13, 1967, p.10.
2. "Proposal for the Establishment by the University of Illinois of a New Institution of Higher Education in Springfield," submitted to the Illinois Board of Higher Education in Behalf of the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois, October 16, 1967, p. 10.
3. Ibid., p. 11.
4. Letter from John Pappademos, President, Executive Board of the Chicago Circle Federation of Teachers, Local 1627, American Federation of Teachers, dated October 29, 1967.
5. A copy of the telegram, dated November 4, 1967, was also sent to Executive Director Lyman Glenny at this home in Springfield and is now in the files of the Illinois Board of Higher Education.
6. Illinois, Board of Higher Education, "Special Committee Agreements," November 6, 1967.
7. Illinois, Board of Higher Education, Master Plan -- Phase II (Springfield, December 1966), pp. 3-6.
8. Ibid., p. 6.
9. Ibid., p. 52.
10. IBHE, "Special Committee Agreements," November 6, 1967, p. 1.
11. IBHE, "Special Committee Agreements," November 6, 1967, "Addendum to the Report," p. 2.
12. David D. Henry, "Comments Regarding the Status of Deliberations of the Board of Higher Education Special Committee on New Senior Institutions," presented to the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois, November 10, 1967.
13. Ibid.
14. Illinois, Board of Higher Education, Report of the Special Committee on New Senior Institutions, Recommendation No. 17. (December, 1967), p. 25.
15. Ibid., pp. 36-37.
16. From a presentation by Ray Page to the Board of Higher Education, January 10, 1968. A formal transcript of the presentation is in the BHE files.

17. "Statement of the University of Illinois Concerning the Report of the Board of Higher Education Special Committee on New Senior Institutions," January 10, 1968, p. 2.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid., p. 8.

Chapter IV

COMMITTEE N AND ALTERNATIVES FOR GOVERNANCE

The inauguration of Richard B. Ogilvie as governor of Illinois in January of 1969 signaled the beginning of a new era in Illinois public higher education. Though Otto Kerner had resigned as governor in February 1968 to accept an appointment to a judgeship on the U.S. 7th Circuit Court of Appeals, the action had resulted in few substantive changes in the organization or operation of public higher education at the statewide level.

Kerner's lieutenant governor, Samuel Shapiro, followed Kerner into the governor's office and he chose not to exercise his statutory authority to designate a new BHE chairman.¹ Thus, the team of Heineman, as BHE chairman, and Glenny, first as associate director and then as executive director, nearly completed an eight-year task which they had begun shortly after the creation of the BHE in 1961. Heineman was the single chairman during the Kerner and Shapiro administrations. Glenny had announced his intention of returning to a faculty position in California prior to the gubernatorial election in November of 1968, but he remained with Heineman except for the final few weeks of the Shapiro administration.

New BHE Leadership

Governor Ogilvie selected George L. Clements, then chairman of the Jewel Companies, to succeed Heineman as BHE chairman. Under the BHE statute, the full board engages professional staff leadership, so the first task before Clements was that of identifying an educator who would be acceptable to the entire board membership.

In May 1969, the board announced the appointment to the BHE executive directorship of James B. Holderman, at the time vice-chancellor of the University of Illinois Chicago Circle Campus. Holderman formally assumed the directorship on July 1, 1969. As two observers of the Illinois scene have put it, Holderman "was particularly sensitive to the political implications of the operation of the IBHE."² Before becoming an administrator at the Chicago Circle campus, Holderman had held an academic position at the Urbana-Champaign campus and an administrative position in the office of the superintendent of public instruction. Thus, he brought with him a knowledge of state government generally and, as a former university administrator, an understanding particularly of the conflict over the system-of-systems concept and the accompanying issue of balance within the systems.

With state government leaders across the country already urging cutbacks in public higher education funding and scrutiny of programmatic development, it was probably inevitable that Holderman would become a center of controversy in Illinois public higher education during his four years as BHE executive

director. But governance was not felt by many observers to be an important item on the BHE agenda when Holderman took office in July of 1969. His major mandate was the completion of Master Plan -- Phase III which had been initiated by the board in 1967. According to 1967 board minutes, graduate and professional education were to be the main thrusts of MP-III.

During his first year as executive director, Holderman made no secret of his feeling that governance would probably require attention at some point during his tenure, but the higher education community was surprised by his recommendation that Committee N on Governance and Committee L on Size and Capacity be reconstituted. According to the BHE staff recommendation submitted to the board on July 7, 1970, "the purpose which Master Plan III is designed to meet would be well served by the immediate re-establishment of these committees."³ The significance of the questions of governance and size, the staff contended, had been made even more critical in part "by recent events." The staff recommendation continued:

While the charge to committees and the personnel would, of necessity, be somewhat modified, the central rationale for re-establishment would be to reconsider these pertinent questions for MP III's comprehensive discussion of scope and mission. If the recommendation of the staff is accepted, the committee charge, in both instances, would be to examine the original committee proposals and subsequent Board actions for comment and possible recommendations for MP III in the context of the parameters of MP III and the campus Master Plans called by the Board of Higher Education.

In each instance, the Committee should review the original charge to the first committee and, where appropriate, speak again to the question raised in the context of the general parameters for MP III.⁴

Second Committee N

At that meeting the BHE approved the staff recommendation for the re-constitution of committees N and L, including the provision that the panels present final reports in "mid-autumn, no later than November 1, 1970."⁵ Target dates for completion of initial drafts of MP-III meant that deadlines had to be set for committees to allow time for their input into the MP-III document. The November 1 deadline put great pressure on Committee N and, as we shall see, on the entire higher education community. In fact, the committee never met or even came close to the deadline. The initial draft of MP-III was to be released February 2, 1971, but Committee N did not formally submit its report to the BHE until May 19.

No announcement was made at the July 7 meeting in regard to the chairman or membership of Committee N. The formal board items for both N and L asserted that "suggested membership for the Committees will be presented in

Executive Session."⁶

Worthy Invited to Serve Again

Apparently between July 7 and August 11, 1970, Clements invited James Worthy to become chairman of the reconstituted Committee N. Worthy had not been a BHE member during the period when he chaired the first Committee N. However, he had been appointed to the board by Governor Kerner shortly after Committee N submitted its report in 1966. He was still a member of the BHE during the period when he presided over the deliberations of the Special Committee on New Senior Institutions in 1967-68. Then, early in 1969, he had resigned from the BHE when it became evident that the management consulting firm with which he was associated, Cresap, McCormick & Paget, would be engaged in business relationships with units of the Illinois public higher education system.

On August 11, 1970, Worthy wrote a formal reply to Clements and mentioned some personal considerations which he wished to be a matter of public record. According to Worthy, "If there are material objections from responsible quarters to my chairing the new Committee N, it is better that they be raised now than later when they might be used to impugn the integrity of the Committee's work."⁷ Worthy also asserted:

Before accepting your invitation, I want to make it a matter of written record that my firm is now or has recently been engaged in the performance of consulting assignments for Southern Illinois University, the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities, Eastern Illinois University and Western Illinois University. Some of this work will undoubtedly continue into the period during which the new Committee N will be active. I have no knowledge that any other units of the Illinois system of public higher education may seek to retain the services of our firm during the next several months, but some of them may do so and I would not wish my involvement in Committee N to preclude our undertaking any such work if the opportunity should come to us.

I also wish to bring to your attention that I have a son-in-law, J. Robert Barr, who is a member of the Board of Regents.

Personally, I do not feel there would be any impropriety - and certainly, no conflict of interest - in my chairing the new Committee on Governance and my firm being engaged simultaneously in the performance of professional work on a compensated basis for one or more units of the Illinois system of public universities. Nor do I feel that my son-in-law's membership on the Board of Regents should be any hindrance to my serving the Board of Higher Education.⁸

A response from Clements dated August 12, 1970, assured Worthy that the board, in executive session on July 7, had agreed unanimously that Worthy's professional activities would in no way jeopardize the study.⁹ However, early in the deliberations of the second Committee N, certain university officials expressed the sentiment that Worthy's business association did represent a conflict of interest.

Sixteen days before Worthy's letter was written to Clements (June 25, 1970), the firm of Cresap, McCormick & Paget submitted a document to SIU entitled "Southern Illinois University: Report on Governance and Administration of the University." The contents of that report are discussed in Chapter VI of this study. The only purpose in citing it here is to indicate that Worthy had been involved in examining the SIU governance situation immediately prior to his appointment as chairman of the second Committee N and was acquainted with problems there.

BHE files show that by August 24 eight other individuals had agreed to serve on Committee N. In letters of that date, Clements expressed his gratitude to these persons for consenting to serve on this "independent body of distinguished Illinois citizens."¹⁰ The committee was requested to "again examine the governing structure of our state system and issue a report, including recommendations for strengthening the system."¹¹ Clements continued:

Given the challenges facing Illinois higher education and the fact that the General Assembly will begin another regular session early in January of 1971, the Board is hopeful that a report might be received from the new Committee N by January 1, 1971. In view of this proposed timetable, Mr. Worthy is planning to convene the first meeting of the Committee on Saturday, August 29, 1970....¹²

Clements' remark in regard to the panel being "an independent body of distinguished citizens" was not mere rhetoric. In terms of public prominence, the group was probably the best known of any committee created by the BHE since its own establishment. Leading the nine-member roster were two former governors, Judge Otto Kerner and William G. Stratton. The two had headed Illinois state government from 1952 through 1967, the most critical fifteen years of postwar Illinois public higher education. Through appointment of various commissions, Stratton had set the stage for the creation of the BHE, and Kerner, of course, had emphatically called for the creation of the statewide coordinating board in his first inaugural address in 1961.

Joining Stratton, Kerner, and Worthy on the second Committee N were the following: Edwin C. Berry, a prominent leader of the black community in Chicago and associated with Johnson Products Company; Dr. Clyde M. Brooks, a Carbondale physician; Marvin Chandler, chairman, Northern Illinois Gas Company, Aurora; Dr. William G. Cole, executive director of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations and former president of Lake Forest College; Judge Richard W. Stengel, 14th Illinois Judicial Circuit, Rock Island; and former

BHE member (1963-69); and Mrs. Carl H. Zwerman, a community leader in Robinson, Illinois.

On August 29, 1970, Chairman Worthy opened the first meeting of Committee N by emphasizing the complexity of the panel's task, and noting the need for all members to review developments which had led to the reconstitution of the committee. He invited BHE Executive Director Holderman to aid him in presenting a broad overview of BHE history and the background of the system-of-systems structure. Holderman characterized the recommendations to come from Committee N as perhaps "the most significant of any pertinent to Master Plan -- Phase III." The BHE director declared:

The phenomenal, almost incredible growth of higher education across the nation, and particularly in Illinois, over the last twenty years makes the question of governance and governing arrangements almost a continuous one.¹³

In what proved to be a prophetic observation, Holderman told Committee N members that enrollment projections suggested cause for concern, for they indicated that the number of students in college by 1980 would be below that of 1973. Other conditions related to governance studies were unrest on campus; soaring costs; concern for the "multi-megaversity"; a credibility gap between the public higher education community, on the one hand, and the public and legislature, on the other; and a possible oversupply of graduate degree recipients. Holderman offered his own interpretation of what the BHE was asking Committee N to do:

Committee N is asked by the Board to evaluate the structure of public higher education in Illinois as developed in MP II. The Committee is not to be encumbered by the existing framework and has an open charge to recommend any realignment of systems it may feel, after its deliberations, to be appropriate.¹⁴

Holderman added that the BHE staff felt it could not make any "sophisticated recommendations" with respect to the total system of Illinois public higher education without answers to certain questions on governance. A set of such questions, approved by the BHE Policy Committee, was presented to Committee N by Holderman and Worthy at the initial session. It was agreed by the committee that early counsel on these questions from the various sectors of Illinois higher education would be essential.

Chairman Worthy was directed to solicit response to these questions from "governing boards, institutional administrations, the faculty, students, non-academic personnel, and other sectors." On September 8 copies of these questions, under the title of "Questions for Consideration," were mailed to leaders in the Illinois public higher education community. This document is reproduced as Appendix B. A three-page cover letter from Chairman Worthy appears at the end of this study as Appendix C. Within that letter, the following paragraph was included:

The Board of Higher Education has requested that Committee N complete its work and submit its recommendations no later than January 1, 1971. To meet this schedule and to give the Committee time to review and consider the responses from the various institutions and systems in the preparation of its final report, it will be necessary for us to receive such materials no later than October 15, 1970.¹⁵

From interviews, newspaper accounts, and other sources it seems clear that the potential significance of the new Committee N did not strike leaders of the Illinois higher education community until they received the September 8 mailing. Along with Worthy's letter and the "Questions for Consideration" was a list of the roster of Committee N. Many institutional administrators previously were aware only that Committee N was being reconstituted and had assumed its membership would be similar to other MP-III committees. The makeup of the panel -- particularly the inclusion of Stratton and Kerner -- alerted institutional presidents and system heads that the committee's activities could represent a serious challenge to the structural status quo in Illinois.

BHE critics immediately responded that Phase III of the master plan had originally been limited to an assessment of graduate and professional education. Holderman's answer was that appropriate settings for graduate and professional education would depend in large measure on each institution's having a clear conception of its mission and scope within a well-coordinated system of public higher education. Governance had major implications for the scope and mission of institutions, and there was no better time to tackle the thorny issues which had plagued the governance of higher education since the original Committee N study.

Typical of the concern being felt around the state was this statement in a fall 1970 publication of the Illinois Association for Higher Education (IAHE):

Reactivation of Committee "N" of the Board of Higher Education has universities and governing board staffs nervous. Reason: this committee will take a new look at the present "system of systems" of governing boards. Most talked about revision in higher education circles is the combination of SIU and the Board of Regents and possible elimination of the State College Board. Such a recommendation by this blue ribbon committee would be hard to stop.¹⁶

It is difficult to reconstruct the planning process which occurred between the reconstitution of committees N and L and the initial draft of Master Plan -- Phase III released in February 1971. Prior to the reconstitution of the committees, the BHE had directed the public senior institutions to prepare long-range campus plans and submit them along with the FY 1972 capital budget requests. Many institutional leaders declared the pressures of responding to a new Committee N were falling upon them at the very time when they were completing their campus master plans. Further, they argued, many of the assumptions which they held in initial planning for the campus master plans conceivably might be affected by deliberations of Committee N and subsequent recommendations to the BHE.

The orientation for Committee N members continued at the second meeting held on September 14. Background presentations were made by Sherman Rosen of Cresap, McCormick & Paget, and Dr. Ernest Palola, a research sociologist at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley.

Campus or System Boards?

BHE Chairman Clements was invited to attend the third meeting of Committee N, held on September 28. Clements urged the committee to consider a variety of structural possibilities for governing Illinois higher education in terms of "new needs."¹⁷ He told the committee of his preference for a state system that would provide each campus with its own governing board. The existing system of systems "creates duplication of effort," and Clements favored the elimination of system governing boards. Such a structure would bring each campus unit closer to its board and would allow board members to take a more active and informed role in institutional governance.¹⁸

Clements' open advocacy for campus boards brought a response from Chairman Worthy that such a plan of separate boards "represents a significant departure from existing governance structure."¹⁹ The latter cautioned his committee against such a recommendation unless "needs are urgent or the opportunities promising." Worthy further expressed concern over the potential centralization of power in the Board of Higher Education under such a system.

Clements' advocacy of campus boards apparently represented the first public comment by a BHE chairman, in the board's decade of existence, indicating any dissatisfaction with the state governing structure.²⁰ Both Clements' presence at the session and his earlier announcements that the reconstituted Committee N was an unprecedented "blue-ribbon" group gave evidence of the importance he attached to its activity. Of particular puzzlement to the Illinois higher education community, however, has been the apparent early estrangement of Worthy and Clements on the campus board question. Appointment of Worthy by Clements had occurred only a few weeks before the September 28 meeting, and the previous two sessions of the group had been mainly procedural in nature.

In terms of the politics of higher education in Illinois, Committee N membership did indeed represent well the architects of the system of systems and the brokers of power who had orchestrated its creation. In particular, the roles of both Worthy and Judge Kerner in the construction of the complex system of systems were important and have already been described. Governor Stratton's critical position as governor immediately before the creation of the BHE in 1960 was nearly as significant.

State politics is far too complex to draw broad generalizations from a single set of episodes such as the deliberations and final report of Committee N, but the circumstances surrounding the appointment and activities of the committee offer a rich mosaic from which one can catch brief glimpses of how state government seems to operate.

Some observers have suggested that Clements' decision to speak in behalf of a radically-restructured system of public higher education in Illinois stemmed from new and difficult political problems which BHE leadership found itself confronting. The BHE found relationships more tense with the universities and colleges in the new period of stringent budgets, and could have more effectively dealt with the enormous resulting problems if separate boards were created for all campuses. By dissolving the system boards the BHE could simply have been following a divide-and-conquer strategy.

Another explanation for Clements' testimony at the September 28 meeting was the reported strained relationships between the BHE and the Ogilvie administration, particularly the governor's new Bureau of the Budget (BOB). The record is clear that, by the time of the meeting, ruptures had occurred between BHE leadership and the BOB. Conflict between BOB Director John McCarter and BHE Executive Director Holderman had been well publicized. A Chicago Daily News Springfield correspondent described the situation as follows:

James B. Holderman, executive director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, has broken with the governor. He complained to the House Appropriations Committee there was no "interaction" between the board and the governor's Bureau of the Budget between the time the education recommendations were submitted and the governor delivered the budget message.

Holderman, a former political ally of Ogilvie who was appointed to the post by Ogilvie, said the board will fight the governor's proposed tuition hikes at state universities and his failure to recommend 7.1 per cent pay hikes for university faculty. The governor asked for 4.5 per cent pay hikes over two years.²¹

Others speculated that Holderman's influence on Clements and their cordial working association were major factors in the latter's appearance before Committee N. A shedding of the intermediate system boards and their replacement by campus boards would have both reduced Holderman's problems within the Ogilvie administration family and strengthened the BHE.

Such speculation probably serves little purpose other than to emphasize what is already known, namely, that higher education had entered a period of austerity and that its representatives in a state administration increasingly would be pitted against those responsible for dividing up the total dollars available for all state services. For those who wished to utilize a conspiracy theory in explaining Clements' -- and Holderman's -- purpose in reconstituting Committee N, their suspicions failed to add up as the Clements-Worthy exchange on September 28 became more widely known. If Clements and Holderman were engaged in a cabal to dismantle the system of systems, why would they appoint a major architect of the concept, Worthy, to chair the prestigious committee whose assent would be required?

Alternative Models for Governance

Following the Clements-Worthy exchange on September 28, Committee N members engaged in their first substantive discussion of alternative structural models which should be considered. Noting the tentative character of alternatives, Chairman Worthy distributed a single sheet containing a list of the broadest range of governance alternatives. The list contained the following eight options:

1. Single Governing Board
2. Governing Boards Geographically Arranged*
 - a. With Board of Higher Education
 - b. Without Board of Higher Education
3. Governing Board Arranged by Typology
 - a. With Board of Higher Education (Probably most accurate description of status quo.)
 - b. Without Board of Higher Education
4. Governing Boards Arranged by a combination of Geography and Typology
 - a. With Board of Higher Education
 - b. Without Board of Higher Education
5. Present system but with elimination of Junior College Board
6. Institutional Governing Boards** with Board of Higher Education
7. Institutional Advisory Boards with Board of Higher Education
8. Institutional Governing Boards with Board of Higher Education, together with regional arrangement for public-private cooperation.

Though few of the eight alternatives became serious options for consideration by the entire committee, individual members did explore the entire range of possibilities from time to time. In some instances, the members exchanged written responses, and the BHE staff assigned to Committee N were requested to provide assessments of possible strengths and weaknesses of alternatives. Within a few weeks, it became evident that most of the options were unrealistic

* In each of these examples, the question arises as to whether institutions under a governing board shall be multi-campus in nature or have only a single campus.

** As used in this listing, "institutional governing boards" are the same as those boards which I have characterized as campus boards.

in terms of the political facts of life. But through the course of the seven-month activity of the committee, many of the alternatives were supported by representatives of different sectors and will be discussed in later sections of this paper.

At the fourth meeting on October 5, Worthy and the committee rejected several of the governance options. Worthy summarized four major alternatives still remaining before the panel for consideration:

- (1) making no change from the current "system of systems";
- (2) rearranging the current system of systems;
- (3) creating an institutional governing board for each campus as well as a regional structure to promote interinstitutional cooperation among public and private institutions;
- (4) creating an evolutionary, experimental governing structure which retains aspects of the system of systems, creates individual boards for certain institutions, and builds in an experimental regional structure to encourage public-private cooperation.²²

Following discussion of these alternatives, the committee authorized Worthy and the staff to prepare a document presenting these alternatives -- with illustrative comments -- to be distributed to governing board chairmen, system heads, and senior institution presidents. This document, formally entitled "Major Alternatives Before Committee 'N'," is included in its entirety as Appendix D. The three alternatives involving changes in the system were discussed in length in the document mailed on October 9, 1970, and specific responses to these options were sought from institutional leaders and others.

Under the heading "I. Rearrangement of the System of Systems," it was noted that the current system "could be rearranged in order to attain greater uniformity by program and mission typology and by geographical location."²³ One possible realignment "toward these ends" was offered for illustrative purposes:

A. Metropolitan Universities: Chicago State College, Governors State University, and Northeastern Illinois State College.

- uniformity of current and planned program offerings (all master level work)
- all located in Chicago Metropolitan Area
- all commuter institutions of similar size

B. Northern Illinois Universities: Northern Illinois University and University of Illinois at Chicago Circle.

- program offerings at similar stage of development
- both located in Northern tier of the state
- comparable size

- C. Central Illinois Universities: Illinois State University, Western Illinois University, Eastern Illinois University, and Sangamon State University.
 - similarity in program offerings
 - located in central region of state
- D. Southern Illinois Universities: Southern Illinois University at Carbondale and Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville.
 - uniform program typology does not apply
 - located in Southern region of the state
- E. The University of Illinois: (with Champaign-Urbana and Medical Center campuses.)
 - the one comprehensive, graduate education, research-oriented public university in the state with a program offering that cannot be compared to that of any other state institution.

As discussed later, this "illustrative" realignment pattern precipitated critical reactions from various sectors, particularly from the University of Illinois, which vigorously opposed the possibility of placing the Chicago Circle campus under another governance system.

In retrospect, the release by Committee N of even a "possible realignment" structure seems a questionable action, which alienated many institutional officials and was destructive of later deliberations of the committee. Many sectors of the Illinois public higher education community became defensive -- and even resentful -- after this document appeared. There is no evidence to suggest that the committee ever favored this particular grouping. Rather, it is more likely that the distribution of a plan involving such radical change was simply an attempt to impress upon the state university leaders that the committee was willing to consider every possible type of reorganization. Yet, from this point forward, it became difficult to draw the institutions into Committee N discussions in anything resembling a constructive fashion.

The document's next option was "II. Institutional Governing Boards for Each Campus" an alternative that represented "a significant departure from existing governing structures."²⁴ Under this option, a statewide planning and coordinating board would be maintained. "With one institution under its jurisdiction a board and each of its members could become closer to and more intimately aware of an institution, its special problems and needs."²⁵ The rationale continued:

Consequently, a board could take a more active and informed role in interpreting an institution to its public constituents and public constituents to their institution. Further the single campus board removes a layering of structure and provides the various segments of the campus community with a clearer conception

of where decisions are made, as well as easier access to the points of decision.

It is also felt that there is a definite need to strengthen the role of the chief executive officer on each campus. While a plethora of forces have in recent years eroded the influence of the chief executive over his institution, top quality leadership is required if an institution is to be given direction and is to cope with the new and changing environment of higher education. With a board for each campus, the chief executive officer of that campus would have direct and immediate access to decision and a direct source of support to rely upon in times of stress.²⁶

These arguments were similar to those which had been advanced in favor of individual campus boards by BHE Chairman Clements at the third meeting of Committee N.

The last alternative offered by Committee N was entitled "III. Evolutionary Systems Institutional, and Experimental Structures for Governance." Its intent was "to capture the advantages of I and II."²⁷ This alternative contained three basic components:

A. Retention of Two Reorganized Governing Board Systems:

1. Metropolitan Universities: Chicago State College, Governors State University, and Northeastern Illinois State College.
2. Central Illinois Universities: Illinois State University, Western Illinois University, Eastern Illinois University, and Sangamon State University.

B. Creation of Institutional Governing Boards for each of the following campuses:

1. Northern Illinois University
2. University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
3. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
4. Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
5. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Response of the Institutions

Many institutional and system leaders now felt that they were laboring under an avalanche of requests from Committee N requiring immediate attention. Responses to the "Questions for Consideration," mailed on September 8, were due in the hands of the Committee no later than October 15. Comments on the "Major Alternatives Before Committee N" were due before October 29, 1970. Further, the letter accompanying the second communication, dated

October 9, expressed the hope that views on the alternatives document might be incorporated into the statements due on October 15.

Looking back on the frantic period of 1970-71, it is tempting to question the hastiness of the Committee N operation and even the need for the reconstitution of the committee. These issues are not academic. If the BHE indeed goes forward in 1974 and 1975 with an examination of governance as a part of Master Plan IV preparation, all parties involved will likely want to develop an understanding of the major sources of tension in the 1970-71 effort.

Much of the immediate tension resulted from the requests for information which the committee wanted the institutions to prepare and return very quickly. Further, the institutions regarded the whole exercise as unnecessary because they were not convinced that an examination of governance was required at that point. These problems were part of a much larger issue which had been seen by Clements and Holderman: the era of unparalleled growth in higher education was drawing to a close. Realizing the impact this change would have on higher education, Clements and Holderman were anxious to include governance in Master Plan -- Phase III. If Committee N were to meet the February 1971 deadline for the first draft of that document, it would have to move rapidly to gather the necessary information and formulate recommendations.

Other events show the gap between the BHE leadership, on the one hand, and the system governing boards and campus leaders, on the other. At the very time when the BHE saw an urgent need for retrenchment in program development, it was receiving campus master plans which contained projections of hundreds of new graduate and professional degree programs. In my opinion, Clements and Holderman were anticipating the pressures to be faced by the BHE in processing these new program requests. They saw this as an immense task and felt that some modification of the governance structure would be required if they were to meet the challenge.

To academic leaders who charged that MP-III was to be confined to an examination of graduate and professional education, Clements and Holderman might well have responded that they felt the state would be unable to handle the demands for new programs without a change in governance. Therefore, to them, it was appropriate to include the governance question in MP-III planning. It was probably unfortunate that Committee N deliberations were tied so closely to the previously-determined deadlines for Master Plan -- Phase III. These procedures did indeed impose upon the institutions and the systems mountains of paper work at a time when they were ill-prepared to handle them.

Footnotes

1. Ill. Rev. Stats., Ch. 144, sec. 182.
2. Samuel K. Gove and Carol Everly Floyd, "Illinois," an article carried as a part of a collection of essays on "The Politics of Public Higher Education," Joseph B. Tucker, ed., AAUP Bulletin (Autumn 1973), p. 290.
3. Illinois, Board of Higher Education, "Staff Recommendation for the Appointment of Reconstituted Master Plan Committee L on Institutional Size and Capacity," (July 7, 1970), Item #9. The rationale for reconstitution of both committees (L and N) was included in the item devoted to Committee L. The formal recommendation for reconstitution of Committee N was made in a short statement, entitled Item #10.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Taken from a letter from James C. Worthy to George L. Clements, dated August 11, 1970, and contained in the files of the Board of Higher Education.
8. Ibid. Barr, a Chicago banker, now serves as chairman of the Board of Regents, the governing board with jurisdiction over Northern Illinois University, Illinois State University, and Sangamon State University. Worthy has since terminated his full-time relationship with Cresap, McCormick, and Paget, but remains on the firm's board of directors. At present, he also serves on the faculty of Sangamon State University.
9. Letter from George L. Clements to James C. Worthy, dated August 12, 1970, and contained in the files of the Board of Higher Education.
10. Letters to Committee N members, dated August 24, 1970.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
13. From remarks by James B. Holderman, delivered August 29, 1970, at the first meeting of the second Committee N.
14. Ibid.
15. Letter from James C. Worthy, dated September 8, 1970, to governing boards, institutional administrators, and other groups and individuals.

16. "Looking Ahead in Higher Education," an unsigned column in The Illinois Professor (Fall 1970-71), Vol. III, No. 1. Published by the Illinois Association for Higher Education (IAHE), affiliated with the Illinois Education Association.
17. Committee N. Minutes, September 28, 1970.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid.
20. Characterization of Clements' comment as public is technically correct but may require some explanation. Records indicate that Committee N fully abided by the Illinois open meetings law and announced through the press and elsewhere notices of all formal meetings. However, neither the press nor the universities appeared to attach much significance initially to Committee N meetings. Thus, the first four or five meetings attracted few non-committee members. Committee members and BHE staff interviewed do not recall that any press representatives or other outsiders were present when Clements made his presentation. In any case, his comments were not given press coverage, and it was many weeks later before state newspapers began editorializing about possible preference of the BHE leadership -- both lay members and professional staff -- for governance alternatives.
21. Daily News, April 11-12, 1970.
22. Committee N. Minutes, October 5, 1970.
23. From a document mailed October 9, 1970, with a cover letter from James C. Worthy, to governing board chairmen, system heads, and senior institution presidents.
24. Ibid., p. 2.
25. Ibid., p. 3.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid., p. 4.

Chapter V

COMMITTEE N AND GOVERNANCE OF CHICAGO CIRCLE AND EDWARDSVILLE

The four-month period from the deadline for responses to "Questions for Consideration," (October 15, 1970) to the date of the final meeting of Committee N (February 27, 1971), may well have seen more documents generated on governance matters than the entire previous history of Illinois public higher education. Committee N designed several "settings" in which these responses were to be presented. It solicited written papers, staged public hearings, and directed the staff to hold meetings where delicate testimony could be given on problems facing particular institutions.

Committee N held its sixth meeting on October 30, 1970, in the form of a hearing, and testimony was received from about two dozen presidents, trustees, system heads, faculty members, and governmental leaders. All system heads favored the existing governance structure. They argued that any reforms required in Illinois higher education were outside the realm of governance. Below the level of the systems, however, there was some sentiment for change.

Chancellor Oscar Shabat, chief executive of the multicampus Chicago City Colleges, admitted a dislike for the very term "system of systems" and argued for a total reorganization of public higher education in Chicago. In his opinion, Chicago Circle should be severed from the U of I board and given an independent board. He recommended a separate "board of higher education" for all other institutions beyond high school in the Chicago area. Only two of the campus executive officers -- SIU-Edwardsville Chancellor John Rendleman and NIU President Rhoten Smith -- advocated consideration of new campus boards for their units. Rendleman asserted that the system-of-systems arrangement encouraged both impersonality and cronyism in governance. He felt his own Edwardsville campus, as an emerging institution unique and different from Carbondale, would benefit from its own board. NIU's Smith said an argument might well be made in behalf of a separate institutional board for his campus. He also noted a built-in conflict between system heads and presidents.

Testimony of two speakers from totally different backgrounds endorsed the notion of separate boards for each campus. They were Lt. Governor Paul Simon, a Democrat serving under a Republican governor, and M. M. Chambers, a scholar of higher education administration and faculty member at ISU. Chambers, in particular, argued that administrative leadership is logically and naturally lodged at the campus level. In an exchange with Chairman Worthy, Chambers claimed the system of systems represented an "inter-position of too many layers." As he had maintained throughout the period of Committee N discussions, Worthy responded that the creation of campus boards would

fragment power and, in turn, cause the dispersed power to gravitate to the BHE.

The two dozen witnesses covered virtually every area of governance. Several individuals, including Simon and Chambers, commented on methods of selecting trustees. Simon and Chambers favored appointed trustees for all systems, including that of the U of I whose trustees are now elected in statewide partisan elections after a nomination process involving the university's Alumni Association and the major party conventions. Simon, in particular, spoke out against major participation by the Alumni Association.

No consensus emerged on October 30 for any reform to strengthen the state's governance arrangement. Chairman Worthy had consistently cautioned against changes in the system of systems. And all system heads -- most prominently U of I President David Henry -- had warned that proposals calling for internal system modifications would be unwise.

Between the October 30 session and the seventh meeting slated for December 5, 1970, Committee N's deliberations became prominently visible through press coverage around the state. In particular, the committee document "Major Alternatives Before Committee N" had aroused attention in politically sensitive settings. A dramatic example of such attention was action taken at a Chicago City Council meeting on November 16. A Chicago newspaper columnist declared that "the City Council protested reported moves to downgrade the Chicago Circle Campus by severing it from the University of Illinois."¹ Mayor Daley interrupted his city budget meeting to charge:

There's a movement afoot to relegate the Chicago Circle Campus to a secondary university. We want a full-fledged university. I know you gentlemen in the Council will join me in the statement that I will fight this movement to the end.²

The council then passed a resolution critical of the proposal to join Chicago Circle with Northern Illinois University. Such negative publicity seriously diminished the chances of any Committee N recommendation being favorably received by the broad political community.

Straw Vote on Circle and Edwardsville

By the time Committee N convened its December 5 meeting, the matter of Chicago Circle overshadowed all others before the panel. Chairman Worthy opened the meeting by noting "the existence of a great deal of public speculation with respect to possible Committee recommendations concerning the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle."³ Worthy emphasized that any recommendations finally presented by Committee N would urge a strengthening of the campus. He reminded his colleagues that the study on governance was coinciding with an unusual situation in the history of the University of Illinois. U of I President Henry had asked the Board of Trustees to relieve him of his duties no later than September 1, 1971. Further, the chancellor

at Chicago Circle, Norman Parker, had submitted his resignation, also effective September 1. Given these conditions, plus widespread speculation in regard to eventual recommendations by Committee N, Worthy suggested that the group assure faculty and staff at Chicago Circle that any recommendation relating to that campus would be directed towards strengthening the total capacity of the campus. The chairman then presented a resolution to this effect, which was passed unanimously by the committee (see Appendix E).⁴

Later in the meeting, Worthy invited members of the committee to express their opinions on the most desirable governance pattern for Chicago Circle. Kerner asserted that a general understanding had existed within the state that the Chicago Circle campus would "be broken off" and given its own governing board when maturity came.⁵ Kerner then expressed his personal preference for a separate governing board for Chicago Circle which would have authority over both the Chicago Circle campus and the Medical Center campus.

One by one, all the others on Committee N except Chairman Worthy joined Kerner in indicating their preference for breaking Chicago Circle away from the U of I Board of Trustees. Thus, eight of the nine members went on record on December 5, 1970, in favor of an independent board for Chicago Circle. As the individual members spoke directly to this issue, some emphasized their desire to see the Medical Center campus governed by the independent board created for Circle. Others simply indicated an agreement with the position which Kerner had initially articulated. Among the group, only Stengel mentioned any reservation whatsoever. He noted some merit in having both the Chicago Circle campus and the Medical Center campus under an independent board and then declared that he would "favor a separate board with reservations."⁶ Chandler and Berry in particular made much of the difference in the "missions" of the Chicago Circle and the Urbana-Champaign campuses.

Noting that the straw vote on Chicago Circle was unanimous in opposition to his own feelings, Chairman Worthy then turned to the matter of governance at the Edwardsville Campus of SIU. He pointed out that many of the same questions raised over the years with respect to governance of the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle applied to SIU at Edwardsville. Dr. Brooks proposed a separate governing board for the Edwardsville campus. There was no dissent when several members of the committee noted a parallel between the Chicago Circle governance question and that of Edwardsville.

The chairman then noted the unanimity of expression -- excluding himself -- on the desirability of independent boards for both the Chicago Circle and the Edwardsville campuses. He next emphasized the significance of any recommendations coming from the committee and urged the members "to be wary of the momentum" which would be built up by action to create institutional boards at even one or two campuses.⁷

Proposal for U of I Campus Presidents

Following the chairman's cautionary remarks, Governor Stratton asked him to elaborate upon a possible reorganization for the University of Illinois campuses which would keep the campuses under a single board. Worthy's sketch of such a plan on December 5 was the first time there was any specific articulation of a proposal which was later to become the major recommendation of the final Committee N report. According to Worthy, a host of circumstances encouraged a strategy to preserve the system of systems while, at the same time, providing an opportunity for remedying the weaknesses which the entire committee felt were apparent at Chicago Circle.

Under the arrangement Worthy offered for consideration, the University of Illinois system presidency would be abolished with the retirement of the current president, David D. Henry. New campus presidencies would be created for Urbana-Champaign and Chicago Circle with both reporting directly to the University of Illinois Board of Trustees. Such a proposal would create a Board of Trustees staff independent of either campus. Under such a reorganization the Medical Center campus should report to the president of the Chicago Circle campus.

Observers from the U of I and SIU left the meeting in a state of disbelief. Led by the two former governors, eight of the nine Committee N members had openly declared that they favored dismembering both the U of I and SIU. Perhaps even more emotionally struck by the straw vote was Chairman Worthy himself. As a major architect of the system of systems and a believer in its viability, he saw the possibility of a dismantling of the entire system.

Though the question of independent boards for the Chicago Circle and Edwardsville campuses dominated the December 5 meeting of Committee N, other items were also discussed. Several times during the meeting the chairman noted the need to discuss the governance of postsecondary institutions in Chicago other than Chicago Circle. Late in the session he pointed out that the committee had given evidence of interest in a new single system within the city of Chicago embracing Northeastern Illinois State College and the eight community college campuses of the City Colleges of Chicago.

Subcommittee on Circle and Edwardsville

In a recapitulation near the end of the December 5 meeting, Worthy reiterated his concern with respect to the exercising of care in making final recommendations to the BHE. He advised the committee to consider the possibility of creating a subcommittee to consult with leadership in institutions likely to be affected by the committee's proposals, particularly those relating to Chicago Circle and Edwardsville. A three-person subcommittee was appointed for this purpose, and Worthy selected William G. Cole as chairman and Marvin Chandler and William Berry as the other members.

Chairman Worthy reminded the full committee of provisions of the Illinois "open meetings" law. He was concerned that the record of the committee not be blemished by a private subcommittee session if it appeared to come into conflict with the Illinois law. Legal counsel advised the chairman that the subcommittee gathering could be handled without risk of offending the law in either spirit or fact. It could be emphasized that the session was being called by the staff of Committee N to gather information which the subcommittee could make available to the full committee for consideration in an open meeting.

Two weeks later the subcommittee engaged rooms in the Chicago Club, a men's club in Chicago's Loop. On the heels of the Committee N meeting where the straw vote revealed an overwhelming desire to sever Chicago Circle from the U of I Board of Trustees, a high degree of tension existed between the subcommittee and U of I representatives.

Among the U of I spokesmen appearing before the subcommittee was Theodore Jones, a black trustee from Chicago. He asserted that it was "paradoxical" that the subcommittee -- a panel of a public agency -- was meeting "in this building, segregated as it is."⁸ He also commented that the proceedings there seemed inconsistent with the land grant idea and the role that Abraham Lincoln had played in the establishment of the land grant institutions. Jones and two other U of I trustees present joined in President Henry's opinion that a separation of the Chicago campuses from the existing Board of Trustees "would suspend forward motion" of these campuses for two years.

NIU President Rhoten Smith reiterated to the subcommittee his moderate support for a separate board for his institution. Something of the basic problem involved in providing for separate boards of trustees for some, but not all state universities, can be observed from the response of spokesmen from Illinois State University. Appearing after Smith had spoken, Acting ISU President Francis Geigle testified that a continuing relationship with the Board of Regents would be adequate in the foreseeable future. However, he indicated it would be "desirable" for ISU to have a separate governing board "if Northern University were to be provided such a separate board."

A delegation of four administrators from SIU appeared before the subcommittee. James Brown, chief of board staff, declared that Committee N had not yet articulated the principles of governance adequately. Clarence Stephens, chairman of the SIU Administrative Council, joined Brown in urging Committee N "to spell out" clearly the basis for any recommendations resulting in the creation of separate governing boards for Carbondale and Edwardsville campuses of SIU. Stephens and Brown reported that a vote of the SIU Administrative Council had been unanimous in favor of retaining a single board for the two campuses. This comment evoked response from the subcommittee to the effect that at least one member of the council had appeared to favor separate boards in testimony before the full committee on October 30. Although this council member was not identified, it can only be assumed that the reference was to Chancellor John Rendleman of the Edwardsville campus,

who had indeed presented such a view.

These discussions were being carried on in the late fall and winter of 1970, at a time when pressure from student bodies for representation on boards of trustees was peaking. Virtually all of the institutional and system representatives had argued against the placement of students or faculty on governing boards with full voting rights. The level of feeling on the part of students is indicated by the proposal presented by the delegates from the U of I Urbana-Champaign Associated Student Council. They reported plans to seek legislative sponsors for a proposal that would place three students, three faculty members, and three citizens at large (appointed by the governor) on the U of I board.

By the time the full Committee N reconvened for its eighth meeting on December 28, 1970, the momentum of the panel appeared to have been lost. The near-unanimity expressed at the December 5 meeting on Chicago Circle and Edwardsville was splintered by the subcommittee's report of no support whatsoever for the separation proposals. As one committee member put it to another before the meeting began, "Our proposals have been shot full of large holes." Another characterized the whole enterprise as a "logjam" and declared that "to make these recommendations would be folly."⁹

The subcommittee itself was uncertain as to the most desirable direction of the full committee. Subcommittee Chairman Cole reported that he was "troubled by the absence of support for autonomy" at Chicago Circle and Edwardsville.¹⁰ He indicated that "allegations" of threats of reprisals for those who might testify in behalf of independence for Chicago Circle had been reported to him and other members of the subcommittee. In view of these allegations, Cole introduced a motion to put the committee's position on Chicago Circle into perspective. Such a motion was passed unanimously and is carried in its entirety at the end of this report as APPENDIX E. The resolution said in part:

I therefore move that the staff be instructed to seek out from the faculties, students and staffs of the Chicago Circle Campus and the Medical Center Campus and from the community, those persons who favor autonomy from the central University administration and solicit their testimony before this Committee and that at the same time the staff should explore ways and means to protect those individuals from any reprisals should such a danger in fact be present.¹¹

Berry supported the resolution only after assurances that it would be possible for all groups, particularly those in the community and not directly attached to the university, to be heard.¹²

The committee also agreed that the staff be directed "to have research done on the legal problems" associated with separate boards for the existing University of Illinois campuses and to "contact legal counsel at both Chicago Circle and Urbana" for exploration of this matter.

Worthy's position at the December 28 session left no doubt in the minds of observers that he was willing to fight to protect the concept of the system of systems and balance within the system. As he put it, there was at that time both vertical and horizontal balance. In regard to vertical balance, Worthy claimed the BHE had certain powers, but it could not impose its will on the governing systems and institutions. Horizontally, a balance existed so that "not even the U of I" could exert undesirable authority over the smallest system. He continued:

As chairman, I have not seen evidence of...reasons for far-reaching, revolutionary, total change in system.... We might see resumption of the dog-eat-dog situation for which the BHE was created to try to stop.¹³

Autonomy in the U of I System

Worthy then reintroduced his plan for abolishing the single presidency of the University of Illinois with the retirement of President Henry and establishing two presidencies, one at Chicago Circle and another at Urbana-Champaign. He also repeated his idea for a separate board staff, located independent of both campuses. Under his proposal, which he termed "autonomy within the system," both presidents would have direct access to the Board of Trustees.

During the discussion of the difficulties likely to be encountered in complete separation of Chicago Circle from the U of I system, several questions were raised in regard to the possible "capture" of most assets and resources by the Urbana-Champaign campus.

In response to Worthy's description of a new U of I system with a chief of board staff, two U of I faculty members who had been sitting as observers during many of Committee N's gatherings asked for recognition. William Sager, professor of chemistry, Chicago Circle, expressed concern over any plan that would place a "technical staff" above campus presidents. Peter Yankwich, professor of chemistry, Urbana-Champaign, argued that "corporate models are entirely inappropriate" for consideration of university management.¹⁴

In response to further arguments for campus governing boards, Worthy contended that a reform should not be disguised under the banner of institutional boards. He repeated his domino theory: that creation of two campus boards would soon lead to several boards. Then power would accrue so rapidly to the BHE that the state would, in effect, soon have a governing board. Worthy felt it would be far wiser to create a statewide governing board "in the open" and appoint a distinguished educator as state chancellor of higher education to head it.¹⁵

Also of concern was the effect of a delay in submission of a final Committee N report on the BHE staff's efforts to develop initial drafts of Master Plan -- Phase III. Executive Director Holderman noted that he planned

to present the first draft of MP-III on February 2. Judge Kerner declared that Committee N was in no position to make final recommendations by that date, and other members agreed.

In accordance with the resolution passed at the December 28 meeting of Committee N, most of the ninth meeting, on January 9, 1971, was devoted to testimony by individuals who favored autonomy of the Chicago Circle campus and/or the Medical Center campus from the central U of I administration. Delegations from two community organizations based near Chicago Circle were present, and their leaders offered testimony in behalf of a separate governing board for that campus. Nancy Jefferson, executive director of the Midwest Community Council, argued that a separate campus board would be a step toward having the university "reach out into the community." Also heard by the committee was Dr. J. Archie Hargraves, president of the West Side Organization and professor of Urban Mission, Chicago Theological Seminary:

What I want to say in behalf of the West Side Organization and in behalf of all the people that I described just previously is, that our dream, gentlemen and lady, has not yet been realized. The great urban university, in spite of its avowed mission, and its transforming vision that has been enunciated very well on occasion, has not related very well to us over the years.¹⁶

Apparently a few letters and several telephone calls had been received from Chicago Circle faculty and staff members in which the individuals apprised the committee members that the announced unanimity on governance among Chicago Circle faculty was not indeed the situation. Yet when Chairman Worthy set the agenda for the January 9 meeting, he found only one faculty member prepared to give formal testimony supporting an independent board for Chicago Circle. She was Dr. Lucile D. Derrick, a professor of quantitative methods in the College of Business Administration. In her testimony, Professor Derrick emphasized the need for "an efficiency of operation" and a "sensitivity to humanity and its needs." She directed comments to her colleagues on the faculty at Chicago Circle:

If you truly want a great and comprehensive university, as you say, then rise up and give the institution the chance it needs to become just that. Sever any ties that bind it so that it can move forward.

In closing, I would like to plead that if the giving us a separate board in Chicago can bring about the qualities mentioned here and so desperately needed. Then, please, let us have it before we die on the vine.¹⁷

In an effort to obtain a perspective from a knowledgeable Chicago educator without links to any of the public institutions, Committee N invited Professor Philip Hauser of the University of Chicago to attend the meeting

and to comment on governance patterns available for Chicago Circle. After noting that he had read the committee's materials but disclaiming any major credentials on the topic, Professor Hauser commented on inevitable administrative difficulties in the U of I arrangement:

To continue to travel 150 miles to administer this institution with the sensitivities and the problems of any university, let alone one involved with the problems of Chicago, strikes me as asking for trouble, and I think the troubles are just beginning.¹⁸

When asked about the proposal for abolishing the existing U of I presidency and appointing two new presidents for Chicago Circle and Urbana-Champaign, Hauser expressed reservation:

I would say that...it is probably risky to attempt to set up a separate president and still have a common board of governance between downstate and upstate University of Illinois.¹⁹

Among the individuals from campuses other than Chicago Circle who made presentations was Paul Burtness, dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Northern Illinois University. He had been a consistent respondent to earlier Committee N queries. In a document handed Committee N members before he spoke, Burtness declared:

As the members of Committee N have already observed publicly, the present juncture of events, with the preparation of Master Plan Phase III and the retirement of several key university officers occurring during the same year, offers a unique opportunity for improving the provisions for governance of public higher education in Illinois. If there are ways in which the present system of systems can be improved, and I believe this to be the case, then it is unmistakably the responsibility of this committee to recommend such changes. We will never have a better opportunity.²⁰

A major point made by Burtness was that the chief officer at the system level should be of the same rank in each system. Some staff officers were not able to represent their constituencies with the same authority and stature as the presidents. Either all such officers should have line authority or all should be limited to staff functions, so that each system representative speaks from a position of similar perspective and equal importance.

Speaking in behalf of "5,000 faculty members" across the state was Professor Donald Polzin of Northern Illinois University, then state president of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). His plea was that the committee establish some clear notion of the mission of

the various public institutions for Master Plan -- Phase III. Faculty members deserved to know "what they were getting into," he said. "Missions do not develop and goals have evaporated," he concluded.²¹

Committee N Recommendations

Committee N held its tenth and final meeting on February 27, 1971, and at that time voted formally on the major issues which had been discussed since the panel's creation the previous July. The votes on critical questions showed a major shift in sentiment on the part of all members, except Chairman Worthy, from the straw vote of December 5 which had favored independent campus boards for Chicago Circle and Edwardsville. Even at the February 27 session, some committee members expressed personal preferences for campus boards for the two campuses. But in the absence of support for such boards on the campuses themselves, the committee was unanimous in a final rejection of that option.

The most significant recommendation approved by Committee N for submission to the BHE was the proposal that the major U of I and SIU campuses each be headed by its own president. Such a recommendation was in conformance with the idea put forward early in committee deliberations by Chairman Worthy under the rubric of "autonomy within the system." Carried formally in the report as Recommendation 19, the proposal urged:

That steps be taken to formalize arrangements whereby the Chicago Circle and the Urbana-Champaign campuses of the University of Illinois and the Carbondale and Edwardsville campuses of Southern Illinois University each be headed by its own president; that each president be supported by an autonomous local administration and report directly to the U of I or the SIU Board, as the case may be; that funds be appropriated directly to each institution; and that a small staff be established to serve each Board but not to interfere in the direct reporting relationship between the Board and its presidents.²²

The narrative accompanying recommendations within the committee report recognized, at least implicitly, that organizational changes of the sort being recommended were within the authority of the U of I and SIU governing boards, not the BHE. Committee discussions had made it clear that even the legislature could not force such an organizational change and keep the governing boards intact. The question of implementation for SIU was moot since that institution's trustees essentially had taken such action several months earlier. However, the U of I board and administration had given clear notice to Committee N that they would vigorously oppose any basic change in the university's administrative structure. Thus when the committee members approved the recommendation, they were aware that their action would be extremely controversial.

According to the Committee N report, members felt that a separate and strong president would be required for Chicago Circle if it were to attain its potential as a great urban university. If Chicago Circle were to stay under the U of I board, as the committee believed it should, "exceptionally strong on-site leadership must be found, and that leadership freed from all but the absolute minimum of central control."²³ However, the committee found itself in the position of advocating what it felt was best but being stymied by the legal structure which kept power to make the necessary decision in the hands of the U of I Board of Trustees. And since the committee was a creature of the BHE, any steps to achieve its desired objectives must come through the BHE. Knowing that only the U of I Board of Trustees could take the necessary action, what was Committee N's strategy? It urged the BHE to use suasion:

In recommending the principle of autonomy for Circle within the University of Illinois system, Committee N urges that every effort be made by the Higher Board to secure the voluntary and, hopefully, wholehearted acceptance of the University of Illinois Board and administrations so that the prospect of what could become a disastrous confrontation can be avoided. Nothing should be left undone to work out a solution which will achieve the end visualized and which the University of Illinois Board and administration can not only accept but positively support.²⁴

Under an accompanying recommendation, the chief executive officer of the U of I Medical Center would report directly to the Board of Trustees, "on a par with the presidents of the two universities of the U of I system!"²⁵ Acceptance of the recommendation to place presidents in charge of each of the U of I and SIU campuses would have resulted in systems closely resembling those governed by the Board of Governors and the Board of Regents.

The other particularly significant recommendation (Rec. 9) would have abolished statewide elections for U of I trustees. With reference to the four senior college and university boards, the proposal recommended:

That all four governing boards consist of nine members, appointed by the Governor by and with the advice of the Senate for six-year staggered terms, with the chief educational officer of the state as a member ex officio of each board.²⁶

Despite earlier testimony in behalf of campus boards by BHE Chairman George Clements and the counsel through the months by Executive Director Holderman to consider other alternatives, Committee N's report endorsed the system of systems. However, two of the committee's recommendations (Rec. 7 and Rec. 8) recognized weaknesses in the functioning of the senior systems.

They argued:

7. That, in general, the four governing boards (Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois, Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University, Board of Regents and Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities) are performing their function diligently and well, but that to some degree, varying from board to board, they are failing to discharge in full their responsibilities for critical review and evaluation of institutional proposals, and that they are tending to assume roles of advocacy at the expense of their primary role of governance.
8. That there is need for the four governing boards to reassert their responsibilities for critical and objective appraisal of institutional proposals, and to improve their procedures for the review and approval of budgets, programs and other matters within their sphere of authority.²⁷

Of the total of twenty-three recommendations in the Committee N report, one other (Rec.2) appears especially important in view of recent events. It urged:

That the autonomy of the Board of Higher Education be preserved and that any efforts of agencies in either the executive or legislative branches to erode this autonomy be resisted.²⁸

On May 19, 1971, Worthy transmitted the Committee N report to BHE Chairman George Clements, and in June of that year he summarized its contents at a board meeting. The Board voted to receive the report. Apparently there has been no discussion of its contents by BHE members.

Footnotes

1. Bob Olmstead, "Council Votes on Circle Status," Chicago Sun-Times, November 17, 1970, p. 28.
2. Ibid.
3. Committee N, Minutes, December 5, 1970.
4. Committee N, Minutes, December 5, 1970, and from the author's notes taken at the session. This assertion by Kerner was challenged in writing within a few weeks by U of I Board of Trustees Chairman Earl Hughes.
5. This assertion by Kerner was challenged in writing within a few weeks by U of I Board of Trustees Chairman Earl Hughes.
6. Committee N, Minutes, December 5, 1970.
7. Ibid.
8. From the author's notes, taken at the session.
9. From the author's notes.
10. The official BHE records do not contain minutes of the Committee N meeting of December 28. However, I was present at the session, made detailed notes, and assume full responsibility for the materials cited.
11. Taken from a document contained in BHE files, entitled "Excerpts from Minutes of Meeting, Committee N on Governance, Board of Higher Education, December 28, 1970, Chicago, Illinois." As I have already noted, formal minutes of this meeting apparently were not placed in BHE files.
12. From the author's notes.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.
16. I have in my possession a transcript of Hargraves's remarks, and the quotations are taken from that transcript.
17. Taken from a written statement read before Committee N, January 9, 1971.
18. From a transcript of Hauser's comments.

19. Ibid.
20. From a memorandum, "Presentation to be Made before Committee N on January 9, 1971."
21. From the author's notes.
22. Illinois, Board of Higher Education, Report of Committee N -- Governing Structure (June 1971), p. 11.
23. Ibid., p. 48.
24. Ibid., p. 51.
25. Ibid., p. 12.
26. Ibid., p. 10.
27. Ibid., p. 10.
28. Ibid., p. 9.

Chapter VI

GOVERNANCE SINCE 1971 COMMITTEE N RECOMMENDATIONS

Any effort to understand governance problems in Illinois public higher education must rest upon responses to the recommendations of the second Committee N and upon developments since the formal Committee N report was submitted to the BHE in the spring of 1971. Recommendations of the Committee N report centering on the U of I and SIU were apparently ignored by the BHE itself. Official BHE records seem to indicate that the agency did not at any point discuss major Committee N recommendations or make formal reference to governance issues until Executive Director Cameron West included the need for an assessment of the system of governance in his March 1974 announcement of plans for Master Plan -- Phase IV. Actually, of course, only the U of I and SIU would have been affected in any major way by Committee N recommendations. Hence much of the following discussion is centered on those two institutions. Though the Committee N report tended to lump the U of I and SIU systems together in calling for reforms, events occurring during the final weeks of the life of Committee N and since the report was issued require that institutional developments be traced separately.

In the case of the U of I, President David Henry, the institutional chief executive for more than fifteen years, had announced his intention to leave the presidency several months in advance of the reconstitution of Committee N. Henry had appraised the Board of Trustees of his desire to terminate no later than September 1, 1971. Thus, a search committee to seek Henry's successor was at work more than three months in advance of the establishment of the second Committee N. The appointment of John E. Corbally to succeed Henry was announced in February of 1971, before Committee N completed its report.

Since 1971 a number of top-level, subpresidential internal organizational changes with possible relevance for external governance questions have been made at the U of I. These will be discussed in brief toward the end of the chapter. Virtually no governance modifications at the presidential or Board of Trustees level have been made in the U of I system since Committee N submitted its report. The institution remains a presidential system in the sense that President Corbally's authority and responsibilities remain precisely those which the Board of Trustees had accorded to his predecessor.

Organizational Changes in SIU System

Changes were also occurring at SIU. President of the institution for nearly a quarter of a century, Delyte Morris, had announced his resignation shortly before the reconstitution of Committee N. By the time Committee N's report was transmitted to the BHE, the SIU Board of Trustees was in the throes of organizational changes. Developments within the SIU system since

the second Committee N are so complex that a great deal of detailed description will be required.

It was noted in an earlier chapter that a private consulting firm, Cresap, McCormick & Paget, had submitted a "Report on Governance and Administration" of SIU to the institution's Board of Trustees in June of 1970. Vice-president of this corporation at the time was James C. Worthy, who had been chairman of the first Committee N (1965-66) and in the summer of 1970 was appointed by BHE Chairman Clements to chair the second Committee N.

Certain aspects of the 1971 Committee N narrative supporting recommendations for changes at both SIU and the U of I resembled proposals presented a year earlier by Cresap, McCormick & Paget specifically for SIU. Major patterns for organizational changes outlined in the consulting firm's report had been adopted at SIU by the time Committee N submitted its report to the BHE. This condition, plus the fact that the BHE has never discussed Committee N recommendations, would lead to the conclusion that the SIU reorganization was based entirely on the private corporation's suggestions, not those in the Committee N report.

Difficulties experienced by the leadership of SIU -- notably President Delyte Morris -- in 1969-70 over the construction of the "SIU Official Residence and Guest Facility" have been described prominently by others. Suffice it to say here that the SIU Board of Trustees ordered construction suspended early in 1970. Details of the suspension, later procedures utilized for completing the project, and emergence of Cresap, McCormick & Paget are set down in a letter dated January 29, 1970, to the chairman of the BHE from the secretary of the SIU Board of Trustees, Melvin C. Lockard:

The Board of Trustees ordered construction of the Official Residence and Guest Facility suspended. W. Clement Stone made a gift to Southern Illinois University Foundation of one million dollars in stock to acquire and complete the facility. Representatives of the Board and Foundation are completing arrangements to transfer the property to the foundation.

We have employed Cresap, McCormick & Paget, Management Consultants, a nationally known firm, to make a management study of the University. This study will take about 16 weeks.

After report has been received and studied, the Board will make desirable organizational changes in an orderly and effective manner, reducing the possibility of future misunderstandings, such as occurred about the Official Residence to an absolute minimum. We will keep the Board of Higher Education informed as we progress.¹

The Cresap study recommended a system in which "substantially greater autonomy" would be conferred upon the two campuses at Carbondale and

Edwardsville:

For practical purposes, both Carbondale and Edwardsville should be considered Universities in their own right, each reporting independently, through the System President, to a single board of Trustees.²

In terms of what later happened at SIU, the narrative supporting this recommendation is more important than the actual proposal:

As the recommendations presented in this report were developed, serious consideration was given to the possibility of doing away entirely with a central administration, abolishing the title "Chancellor", and designating the head of each campus as President of an independent University.³

In about one year's time the SIU board accepted the plan of organization to which the private consulting firm had given "serious consideration." The Cresap study noted that this course would restructure SIU "along the lines of its sister systems, the Board of Regents and the Governing Board of State Colleges and Universities."⁴ Under such an arrangement, each "university" would report directly and independently to the SIU Board of Trustees, in exactly the same manner as the member universities of the Board of Regents and the Board of Governors.

The Cresap study also recommended the retention for the time being of the system president, with modifications to allow this officer "some significant opportunities." According to the consultants, the proposed plan "returns some of the functions now performed by the President to the Board of Trustees, and others to the Chancellors," and frees the "Office of the System President from a load of burdensome administrative details and offers a new range of possibilities."⁵

Such possibilities were to be achieved, in part, through a "chief of board staff" who would be responsible solely to the board and would supervise a professional staff employed by the board and responsible only to the board. This position would be generally similar to the position of:

Executive Officer of the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities and of the Board of Regents of Regency Universities.⁶

The title, chief of board staff, was suggested to emphasize the direct reporting relationship of the officer to the board and the staff relationship of the officer to the university administration. He was to support the board by seeing that it had adequate information on all matters coming before it. He would also provide close and continuing liaison with the staff of the BHE, ensuring that all proposed policies and programs within the SIU system were in line with BHE policy.

After the many years of leadership provided by Delyte Morris, one can hardly imagine an arrangement more sharply different from the Morris pattern. While suggesting that the presidency be retained, the Cresap group was proposing that the chief of staff would, in effect, keep the board informed of activities within the total university system, yet would exert no line authority.

According to the study, such a drastic step was required because academic programs and growth at SIU were threatened by poor administration, an ineffective Board of Trustees, and too much power in the president's office. The relationship between the two campuses was ill-defined and the central administration itself was both ill-defined and ineffective. These conditions were sources of constant friction.

President Morris attacked the report, charging it showed an

inconsistency between praise for the University's growth and accomplishments and its general disparagement of the University's management as if the growth had taken place in spite of the management. Surely the board must have been doing something right during all of the years of the University's success.⁷

With Morris' resignation to be effective on September 1, 1970, there was a critical need on the part of the Board of Trustees to move quickly to decide how much of the Cresap report it would accept over an interim period and how much would be implemented on a more permanent basis. At a meeting on July 8, the board approved the creation of an office of board staff. A committee was designated to define the duties, authority, and responsibilities of the board staff's chief officer. At its August 3 meeting the board approved six resolutions which were to start SIU down a path strewn with unprecedented conflict.

The initial resolution formally created the position of chief of board staff, "reporting solely and directly to the Board of Trustees."⁸ In view of later changes in the position and the resulting controversy, it might be helpful to review certain of the duties originally given to the chief of staff:

BE IT RESOLVED, that the position of Chief of Board Staff, reporting solely and directly to the Board of Trustees, is hereby established, and that functions of the position shall be as follows:

- (1) To serve as educational analyst and advisor to the Board, to the University Administrative Council and to the Chancellors, recommending actions to coordinate the programs and operations of the constituent institutions of the Southern Illinois University System,
- (2) To maintain liaison with the Board of Higher Education

in its role as coordinator of Illinois public higher education,

- (3) To keep the Board and the University Administrative Council informed of all legislation affecting the University,
- (4) In coordination with the Chairman of the University Administrative Council, to represent the interests of the Board before external agencies, such as the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of the Governor,
- (5) To supervise the staff review and analysis of all budgets and make recommendations to the Board regarding their adoption,
- (6) To supervise the review by staff of the Board of present and proposed academic programs and make recommendations to the Board regarding approval before submission to the Board of Higher Education....⁹

A total of thirteen functions were outlined for the chief of board staff. The board also authorized the appointment of staff assistants for the chief of staff.

The second resolution served to appoint Dr. James M. Brown, an administrator in the SIU system, to the position of chief of board staff, effective September 1, 1970.

The third resolution declared that the position of SIU president be eliminated as of September 1, 1970. The period September 1, 1970, through August 31, 1971, was designated a transitional period during which further evaluation -- and "implementation as found appropriate"-- of the Cresap group report and university committee activity would continue. During the transitional period the authority previously exercised by the president would be vested in a "University Administrative Council." Membership of the Council would consist of the following:

- A Chairman, to be named by the Board.
- The Chancellors of the Carbondale and Edwardsville Campuses.
- Two System vice presidents to be named by the Board.
- The Chief of Board Staff, serving without vote.

The chairman of the University Administrative Council was designated the "Chief Executive Officer" of the council. Principal duties and responsibilities of the council were prescribed in seven detailed sections.¹⁰

In the fourth resolution, the Board of Trustees approved the appointment of Dr. Clarence W. Stephens, professor of education at SIU, as the council's chairman.

Formal minutes of the August 3 meeting reveal that the firm of Cresap, McCormick & Paget was retained to "advise and assist the Board in matters of reorganization and University governance" beyond that date. The consultants were to be utilized "under such terms and conditions as the Board may determine" and their services were to be reviewed "every month from the date of employment until terminated."11 The minutes also indicate that a special search committee recommending Brown's appointment to the full board had employed the Cresap group to provide assistance.

On September 1, 1970, in accordance with the trustees' decisions, Delyte Morris became president emeritus, the systemwide University Administrative Council began to function, and the newly appointed Chief of Board Staff James Brown took charge.

The year of functioning under the University Administrative Council coincided almost precisely with the deliberations of the second Committee N. Major administrative figures in the development of responses to Committee N were -- in addition to Brown and Stephens -- Robert Layer, who had recently become acting chancellor at Carbondale and John Rendleman, chancellor at Edwardsville.

A voluminous official literature was generated during the period September 1, 1970, to September 1, 1971, as the council, the trustees, and Brown attempted to "systemize" the institution which so long had been managed chiefly by one man, Delyte Morris.

At a meeting on July 16, 1971, the trustees confirmed the change to separate campus administrations. Effective September 1, the post of chancellor was to be abolished at each campus, and chancellors were to be promoted to the rank of president. In the words of board President Harold Fischer of Granite City, "the July 16 decision establishes the autonomy" of the campuses at Carbondale and Edwardsville. At the trustees' August 20 meeting the university by-laws were changed to abolish the University Administrative Council and to elevate the chancellors to president. Minutes of the meeting include a formal resolution appointing the presidents of the two campuses:

...NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University in regular meeting assembled, that:

Robert G. Layer, Professor of Economics serving also as Chancellor, Carbondale Campus, be and is hereby appointed Professor of Economics, to serve also as President of Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, effective September 1, 1971, to serve in the latter position at the pleasure of a majority of the total Board membership and until the effective date of the appointment of a President on a permanent basis, and his salary is fixed at 38,000 per annum, and

John S. Rendleman, Chancellor, Edwardsville Campus, and Professor in the Social Sciences Division, be and is hereby appointed President of Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, and Professor in the Social Science Division, effective September 1, 1971, to serve at the pleasure of a majority of the total Board membership and his salary is fixed at 38,000 per annum.¹²

The only difference in the wording of the appointments of Layer and Rendleman was that Layer would serve "until the effective date of the appointment of a president on a permanent basis." With the help of an executive search consulting firm, the SIU Board of Trustees soon selected David Derge, political scientist and administrator at Indiana University in Bloomington, to become president of the Carbondale Campus, effective in the spring of 1972.

With arrival of Derge on the Carbondale campus the stage was set for the first test of the new arrangement for "autonomy within the system" and for the first real attempt to return to administrative normalcy since Morris' departure two years earlier. Derge's reputation was that of an efficient, hardnosed administrator, and speculation centered immediately on his effectiveness in interacting with Rendleman and Brown; the other two major executives in the system. Newspaper writers were later to characterize the three as a "troika." Rendleman possessed twenty years of high-level experience in the SIU system during its years of phenomenal growth. Following his graduation from the University of Illinois College of Law in 1950, he for a few months had held a position as assistant legal counsel at the U of I before accepting a similar position with Delyte Morris at SIU. In 1968 he became chancellor at Edwardsville when the chancellorship system was adopted at SIU. Brown had entered the system in 1966 as a member of the English faculty. He had been tapped quickly for administrative responsibilities and had held the title of "special assistant" to Morris when appointed chief of board staff.

To understand the full significance of the troika characterization, one must return to the August 20 trustees meeting and the arrangement which began operating in September of 1971, keeping in mind the backgrounds of the three figures who were destined to be harnessed together during a period of high drama in SIU's history. In almost "folklore" style, a regional literature has developed in the press and elsewhere surrounding the interactions of these three executives with one another and with the Board of Trustees.

Elsewhere I have referred to the "domino theory" which James Worthy presented from time to time. This was the idea that the creation of a separate board of trustees for any campus in the state would set off a series of reactions establishing separate campus boards at most other senior campuses. If this notion is correct, any conflict at SIU resulting in a separate board for the Edwardsville campus would assume statewide importance. Many others besides Worthy agree with this assessment, and argue that unless SIU puts its house in order, higher education in Illinois should be

prepared for changes in governance throughout the system. For this reason I shall trace the stormy history of SIU in the past three years in greater detail than I treat developments at other institutions.

A baseline for understanding the controversy is the set of resolutions approved by the SIU Trustees at the August 20 meeting. The introduction to the basic resolution follows:

WHEREAS, The positions of President of Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, President of Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, and the Office of the Board Staff have been created to develop the decentralization of Southern Illinois University from a single centrally-controlled institution to a system of operationally autonomous universities, and

WHEREAS, There has been some confusion both within and without the System as to the exact functions of these officers and the authority of the incumbents in these positions has enabled an evaluation of functions.

BE IT RESOLVED, That the following functions are set for these offices for the purpose of guidance of all involved.

Minutes of the meeting record the designation of specific functions to the two presidents and the board staff. Each president was to be "responsible directly to the Board of Trustees and shall have direct access to the Board and its members." Each president was also to be the chief executive and administrative officer "of his university."¹³

There are some in the SIU community who believe that the 1971 document was unclear on the matter of external affairs, and this has been a source of contention. Directives show the board was attempting to make some subtle distinctions. For instance, a subsection of one resolution declared, in regard to the presidential authority:

In geographic areas near his university and in areas of concern peculiar to his university, he shall represent Southern Illinois University in its relationship to external agencies and shall interpret the University's goals and achievements. In areas of System or Board concern he shall represent the University to the extent practicable in coordination with the other President and Chief of Board Staff. All matters relating to State agencies shall be considered to be of Board concern.

In a portion of the report outlining the external functions of the chief of board staff, the following was ordered:

1. When it is mandatory that one person represent the Southern Illinois University System and this is not done by a Board Member, he shall represent the System in its relationship to external agencies, including the Governor's Office, Bureau of the Budget, Legislature, Board of Higher Education, Illinois Building Authority, and at conferences of System Heads.
2. Whenever it is more effective to expand external contracts to include the University Presidents or their representatives, this should be done.
3. He is authorized to sign documents on behalf of the Board which relate to the entire System rather than to one University and which are not to be signed by the Board officers.
4. He shall provide information to news media on behalf of the Board.
5. He shall maintain liaison on behalf of the Board with the Southern Illinois University Foundation and the Southern Illinois University Alumni Association.¹⁴

It is tempting to include other passages, but space does not permit such a detailed review. However, one additional section, protecting the presidents from the chief of board staff, is pertinent:

1. He [the president] shall be directly responsible to and shall accept direction only from the Board of Trustees.
2. The Chief of Board Staff may inform the President of Board policy or action but shall not direct the President in regard to his actions in managing the affairs of his university.
3. He shall have direct access to the Board of Trustees and the members thereof.¹⁵

Files of southern Illinois newspapers bulge with stories of the difficulties encountered by the troika as the three attempted to carry out the directives of the Board of Trustees in subsequent months. Apparently, late in 1972, the complexities of operating under the original charges became so visible that the trustees decided the situation required additional formal study. The Committee on Board and Executive Officer Relationships was commissioned to prepare a special report on system problems. A report prepared by this committee was presented to the board and approved on March 9, 1973.

In an introductory statement, the report declared that experience to date in the decentralization process had been "desirable for evaluation." Problems had been reviewed and further directives were being recommended by the committee "to complete the decentralization process and to clarify the handling of functions in which there must be involvement beyond the individual University."¹⁶ The committee asserted that the statements of August 20, 1971, remained basically sound and that only minor changes were being proposed in the attached report.

In the next breath the committee proposed that a "complete plan" for the decentralized SIU universities should include adoption by the entire board of updated statements on:

1. Guidelines for Functions of the Board of Trustees of SIU
2. Creation and Function of a new SIU System Council
3. A revised statement on functions of Presidents and Board Staff

A section on external affairs in the "Guidelines" acknowledged that "the functions of the Board in external affairs are comprehensive and are difficult to delegate."¹⁷ Probably the most significant element in this section of the report was the proposed board delegation of external affairs, except those specifically exempt, to the newly-created SIU System Council.

Some observers felt that the creation of the System Council meant that within less than two years from the August 20, 1971, endorsement of a new plan of decentralization, the board was retreating toward centralization. In a preamble to the 1973 recommendations the committee declared:

In order to coordinate the two Universities' efforts and plans and to facilitate the operation of the Southern Illinois University System, the Board of Trustees creates a Southern Illinois University Council.

This Council is in some degree modeled after the Council of Presidents of the old Teacher's College Board and the Council of Presidents of the present Board of Governors and Board of Regents. It is designed to coordinate the two Universities into a System and at the same time to preserve the sovereignty of the Presidents in the operation of their respective Universities.¹⁸

The new System Council would be composed of the two presidents and the chief of board staff. The chairmanship would rotate between the two presidents each calendar quarter. The chief of board staff would serve as the permanent secretary of the body. Actions by the council were to be by unanimous vote, and in the event of a disagreement the matter would be referred to the Board of Trustees for decision. In the event a decision was required before the next meeting of the trustees, the problem would be submitted to

the three officers of the board and a decision of two of them would be followed until the matter could be submitted to the full board.

A detailed section entitled "Concerns" attempted to spell out policies for the council in all likely situations. Again, the matter of appearances before external agencies appeared to be critical, and the recommendation proposed this solution:

The individual or individuals to appear before external agencies and the method of presentation shall be determined by the Council. The individual chosen may be a Council member. In most instances, such as legislative proceedings, legislators wish to communicate directly with the Presidents on their University matters. This should be encouraged.¹⁹

In sections covering relationships of the presidents to the Board of Trustees and the chief of board staff, it was made clear once again -- as it had been in the resolutions approved in 1971 -- that the presidents would have direct access to the Board of Trustees. It was also reiterated that the chief of board staff could inform a president of board policy or action but could not direct the president in regard to his actions in managing the affairs of "his University."

In a section devoted to the functions of the board staff, it appears that a degree of authority not previously accorded the chief of board staff was extended to him:

When it is mandatory that one person represent the Southern Illinois University System and this is not done by a Board member, he may after discussion and concurrence with the System Council represent the System in its relationship to external agencies including the Governors Office, Bureau of the Budget, Legislature, Board of Higher Education, Capital Development Board, and at conferences of System Heads.²⁰

The ambiguity in the document, which some critics have centered upon, is illustrated by the paragraph which immediately follows the above directive:

Whenever it is more effective to expand external contacts to include the University Presidents or their representatives, this should be done. System representation may be delegated by the Southern Illinois University System Council.²¹

A detailed history of the SIU system would include many other problems which plagued the institution, particularly those which directly faced President Derge at Carbondale. National attention was focused on that campus in December 1973 when Derge announced that 104 staff and faculty

members, some of them tenured, would be terminated in a \$2.7 million budget cut. Many faculty and students charged that the president should have foreseen the cuts and phased the jobs out gradually. In early January the faculty Senate at Carbondale asked the Board of Trustees to remove the "higher administration" for its handling of budget cutbacks. Midst the faculty firing episode and a host of other controversies at Carbondale -- some of them related to governance and others of a more personal nature -- the procedures for handling systems operations apparently became even more complex and confused.

On January 19, 1974, the SIU Board of Trustees received and approved another report from the Committee on Board and Executive Officer Relationships. Committee members asserted that a review of operations since the March 1973 document had convinced them further amendments were needed:

These amendments are aimed at clarifying the intentions of the Board and facilitating the achievement of goals which were basic to the March report.²²

The January 1974 report expanded the authority of the chief of board staff in several areas at the expense of the campus presidents. The most dramatic change was the elevation of the chief from secretary to permanent chairman of the SIU System Council. Under the previous document, the chairmanship of the council had rotated between the two presidents.

In another section the chief was handed the authority to coordinate virtually all affairs with state agencies:

The individual or individuals to appear before State agencies and the method of presentation shall be determined by the Chief of Board Staff acting as Chairman of the System Council on a System basis with the advice, support, and involvement of the System Council.²³

Perhaps the most explicit strengthening of the authority of the chief related to the direct responsibility for affairs external to the university. In a virtual rewriting of the original document, the chief was given a new directive:

He shall be responsible for external relations for the System, except as otherwise delegated, including relationships with the Governor's Office, Bureau of the Budget, Legislature, Board of Higher Education, Capital Development Board, and at conferences of System Heads.²⁴

Finally, the chief was designated as the official representative of the Board of Trustees. Directions and interpretations of board policy given by the chief to a president were to be considered directions of the board itself unless a president could successfully persuade the board to rescind a directive by the chief.

The committee claimed that the report "does not make any basic change in the Board's present policy."²⁵ Yet in view of the organizational and functional rearrangements recommended by the committee and adopted by the board, it is difficult to follow the reasoning of the committee. The report continued, "The basic operational autonomy of the two universities" is retained. "Their missions, histories, and constituencies are different. We applaud that difference and intend to see that they be allowed to continue to develop in their own pattern."²⁶ Of particular interest for this paper is reference to the system of systems:

Southern Illinois University as a System is vital in retaining the balance within the System of Systems of the State of Illinois. It is also vital to retaining the great educational opportunity to which the youth of Illinois is entitled. Unified efforts and policy are essential to accomplish this. Only a limited amount of money will be available to Illinois for higher education. The Board must see that SIU gets its fair share and that we get the most out of our educational dollar.²⁷

The final paragraph of the report invited reviews and suggestions from the "appropriate constituencies of each University."

Before the committee or the full board could begin the task of assessing the responses, a new set of problems struck the Carbondale campus. On February 2, 1974, Danilo Orescanin, the second highest campus officer, resigned as vice-president amid reports of irregularities of nearly \$5,000 spent for alcoholic beverages. In what appeared to the public as a rapid deterioration of both internal administrative operations and system affairs, pressures quickly mounted for President Derge's removal from office. At an SIU board meeting on March 14, the Carbondale president tendered his resignation. One downstate newspaper made the announcement this way:

The stormy, two-year reign of David R. Derge over Southern Illinois University-Carbondale has ended.

The 45-year old university president whose troubles have ranged from Watergate to hearing systems announced his resignation Thursday after a meeting of the Board of Trustees.²⁸

The visibility of the troika is evident in the attention this news story (and others as well) gave to the relationships between the three administrators:

Derge also was slighted when the Board of Trustees placed James M. Brown, the board's chief of staff, in charge of the presidents of SIU-Carbondale and SIU-Edwardsville. The three executives previously had been equal.²⁹

Following the acceptance of Derge's resignation as president, SIU board Chairman Ivan A. Elliott announced that Hiram Lesar, dean of the university's School of Law, would become temporary president until a permanent replacement could be found. A search committee, chaired by Vice-President Willis Malone, was immediately appointed, and at this writing the committee is said to be narrowing its list of candidates and soon plans to submit one or more recommendations to the board.

With the appointment of Lesar, the SIU system and its various constituencies were once again in a position to consider the invitation from the board to respond to its January 19 policy statement. An editorial in the Edwardsville Intelligencer on January 30 caught the flavor of the reaction to the document:

Southern Illinois University's Board of Trustees still has not dealt with the basic flaws in the university's governing system.

Last month the board modified the clumsy troika setup which has guided the SIU system in recent years.

The board gave the chief of its staff, James Brown, line authority over Carbondale campus president David Derge and Edwardsville president John Rendleman with whom Mr. Brown was previously co-equal.

But the trustees did not clearly delineate the nature of Mr. Brown's authority.³⁰

The editorial criticized the inconsistency in the new governance document. In one section, the trustees stated that the chief "shall not engage in operational activities within either university." Three paragraphs below: "Directions and interpretations of board policy given by the chief of board staff to a president will be directions of the board unless a president asks the board to rescind the direction and the board does so." A majority of the vocal constituents seemed to agree with the newspaper that the "mandate of the new governance document is mainly one of confusion."³¹

By the May 9 meeting the board had received a large number of responses, but the trustees decided they wanted more time to study the comments. Faced with almost universal criticism of the new administrative pattern, the board scheduled a public hearing in Edwardsville on June 13, to hear complaints. In advance of the hearing, board Chairman Elliott added a further welcome to campus groups to submit proposed modifications to the January document: "You don't have to assume anything except one board and two universities...."

Elliott reported to the press that written comments ranged from advocacy of a strong central presidency to the return of power to the two presidents. Newspaper accounts suggest that administrators had had difficulty interpreting the general meaning of the responses. Board Chief of Staff James Brown

was reported saying he tried to write some kind of general summary of the comments but that "I found myself defeated at every turn."³² John Rendleman said that the only summary he could prepare was "Nobody seems to like it [the new setup]."³³

The controversy and confusion in the SIU system were bringing public disenchantment and represented a potential threat to the existing system of systems. The notion that impatient legislators might attempt to solve SIU's problems with statewide changes seems to be supported by news and editorial coverage by a newspaper in Champaign-Urbana, where the main campus of the U of I is located. The Champaign-Urbana Courier declared editorially on May 14:

The Southern Illinois University Board of Trustees must come to grips with the unworkable administrative structure it has created.³⁴

The newspaper called upon the SIU board to name a chief executive for the system, someone "who has clear authority adequately to represent the university in the state and who effectively can coordinate the activities of the two campuses."³⁵

At their June 13 meeting the SIU board did indeed provide an opportunity for public airing of system problems, and spirited exchanges ensued among the trustees and leaders of several constituencies. Spokesmen for the campus senates were present, and direct exchanges occurred between these faculty leaders and board members. During one such exchange, veteran board member Harold Fischer asserted that he had always been for autonomy for the two campuses and that he was certain the other individuals on the board were too. This prompted John B. Hawley, president of the university senate at Carbondale to retort: "This is the first time we've heard publicly that this board favors autonomy."³⁶

On matters relating to statewide governance, several Edwardsville spokesmen expressed the desire that their campus president have the authority to communicate directly with the BHE. Among these was David Huntley, chairman of the Edwardsville Department of Art and Design, who declared, "The present administrative officer system is another obstacle -- and a very expensive obstacle."³⁷

The discussion also revealed some sharp differences of opinion among the trustees, which became most visible during board debate on a motion to establish a systemwide committee to examine system operations under the January reorganization. Major source of controversy was the meaning of the word "autonomy." Trustee Margaret Blackshere introduced a motion to create such a committee, and more than two hours were required to amend the motion for final approval. Blackshere's original motion would have established a committee to explore "a policy of complete autonomy for both campuses, with the board staff acting as advisors and researchers for the board (italics mine)." The motion as amended and approved provided "that the Board establish

a procedure to suggest any revisions...necessary to ensure maximum autonomy of each university within the SIU system (italics mine)." A report from the systemwide committee is the first step in such a procedure.

In a departure from the usual practice of Illinois boards of higher education, the SIU board opposed its chairman, who was the lone dissenter in the 6 to 1 vote. During discussion before the vote, board members resisted a move by Elliott to have the word "autonomy" removed from the motion. Elliott defended his opposition to the motion on the grounds that he could not understand how such a committee charge could result in action changing the administrative pattern approved in January. He also expressed the belief that another examination of the administrative structure would "perpetuate unrest in the administration and hinder the presidential search" on the Carbondale campus.

Among those suggesting that an all-university committee be established was Francis Villemain, a professor of education on the Edwardsville campus. He admitted that his campus had been

established as a child of Carbondale [but] we've reached the point where academic colonialism is no longer productive. I believe the time has come to grant Edwardsville Commonwealth status.³⁸

At this writing, the twenty-member systemwide committee has not yet reported back to the Board of Trustees. It is significant that the board excluded both the chief of board staff and the campus presidents from membership on the special committee.

For the present, then, the SIU board has rejected two extreme alternatives for which there is some scattered support within the broad SIU community. These are (1) the return to a single system presidency, which would move the system away from the Board of Regents and Board of Governors model toward the U of I pattern; and (2) independent boards for the two campuses. Chairman Elliott's invitation for comments on the January 19 policy statement assumed "one board and two universities." And the special systemwide committee was given a clear charge to investigate possibilities of "maximum autonomy" of two universities under a single board.

If the SIU Board of Trustees retains its present membership, it seems unlikely that a superpresidency will be reinstituted. At the meeting on June 13 the members explicitly agreed that under no circumstances would there be a return to a single system presidency. Only indirect "political" action from the state capitol is likely to change this. Two present members of the SIU board -- William Allen and Harold Fischer -- must either be reappointed or replaced by the governor early in 1975. Some observers have speculated that two new members could influence the board to back away from the policy which expanded the authority of the chief of board staff.

Any movement towards the other extreme organizational alternative -- that of separate boards for the two campuses -- must originate in the General Assembly. The present SIU Board of Trustees was created by the legislature, and a dismemberment would require action there.

In a vote taken on December 5, 1970, the second Committee N had agreed tentatively upon a plan to recommend a separate board for the Edwardsville campus. John Rendleman had testified to the committee that a separate board would offer certain advantages to his campus. Later, of course, Committee N retreated from that position and formally recommended retention of a single board and autonomy within the system. At the June 13 meeting there was no testimony in support of separate boards.

In a press conference following the June 13 board meeting, Chairman Elliott touched upon this question. When asked about disagreements he might have with President Rendleman, he replied:

We just disagree, that's all. He wants two boards. I think that would be disastrous for the university.³⁹

Developments in Other Systems Since 1971

Inordinate attention has been paid to the problems of SIU because continued instability within that system represents the most likely source of statewide frustration -- felt in both the executive and legislative branches -- which could result in attempts to modify basic governance patterns of higher education in Illinois.

U of I and Circle Campus Mission

Probably the most intense controversy generated between the U of I leadership and the second Committee N related to the mission of the Chicago Circle Campus. In its formal report, Committee N declared that with urban "needs omnipresent and funds ample for the mission, Circle has met in only small part the great challenges and opportunities confronting it."⁴⁰ Committee members unanimously felt that developments at the Circle campus had been carried on almost wholly in the traditional research and curriculum pattern of the Urbana-Champaign campus.

Perhaps semantic confusion caused some of the disagreements, but substantive differences were also present. The committee urged the state and the U of I trustees to identify Chicago Circle as the nation's first "urban grant" university. The committee declared:

A "comprehensive urban university" is not the same as a "comprehensive university with urban programs." Much of the difference that appears to exist between the Committee and the University is rooted in the subtle but profound distinctions between these two ways of conceiving the mission of Chicago Circle.⁴¹

Committee N members argued that a characteristic distinguishing an urban university from a traditional institution is its focus on problem solving.

To obtain leadership to develop such a focus, Committee N felt the Chicago Circle campus should be permitted to move with far greater freedom from the central U of I administration than it had thus far enjoyed. The committee recommended that a president, reporting directly to the Board of Trustees, be installed in place of the campus chancellorship. The committee was emphatic in its conviction that exceptional on-site leadership would be required to achieve the kind of programmatic reforms envisaged:

It would be impossible to recruit a man of the requisite strength who had to report to a system president, whether that president were located in Urbana-Champaign or anywhere else. It would be essential that he be every inch a president in his own right, responsible to no higher authority than the Board of Trustees. No lesser status would be acceptable to the kind of person required if the thrust and character of the institution is to be modified.⁴²

One of Committee N Chairman Worthy's early arguments for making in a change in the U of I administration was the planned departure in 1971 of the system president, David D. Henry, and Chicago Circle Chancellor Norman Parker. John Corbally, president of Syracuse University, was appointed to succeed Henry as president of the system, effective September 1, 1971. Shortly thereafter, upon recommendation of both Henry and Corbally, Warren Cheston, dean of the School of Technology, University of Minnesota, was appointed Chicago Circle chancellor, effective the same date.

Although the U of I has been spared the kind of publicized management traumas experienced by SIU, there have been internal reorganizations which certainly relate to the Committee N recommendations and perhaps to statewide governance questions. These changes cannot be understood without tracing the career and retirement of a U of I officer whose impact on the total system almost rivals that of President Henry. This is Lyle Lanier, provost and executive vice-president from 1960 until 1972. After serving in this capacity until retirement age, Lanier ordinarily would have retired at the time of Henry's leaving. However, he accepted the board's invitation to remain for an additional year to aid in the transition to the Corbally administration.

Lanier's title of "provost and executive vice-president" provides the key to an understanding of his critical role in the development of the U of I system since 1960. Responsibility for both academic and budgetary development was lodged in Lanier's office, and the willingness of President Henry to delegate almost all authority in these areas to Lanier gave the latter system influence unmatched in Illinois institutions of higher learning -- and probably in most institutions in the country.

Chancellors of the three U of I campuses reported to Lanier in all major areas. In carrying both programmatic and budgetary proposals to the BHE,

Lanier was a key U of I spokesman. Against the backdrop of the Committee N recommendation for greater freedom from the central administration and even a separate president for the Chicago Circle campus, a reorganization of the central administration since Lanier's departure takes on particular significance. Putting aside the merits of the recommendations, has the U of I taken any steps to conform with the panel's suggestions? The answer appears to be no, but the issues are far too complex to provide a simple answer.

The U of I Board of Trustees has ignored the suggestion that a separate Chicago Circle president, reporting only to the board, head that campus. Further, it seems clear that the system leadership has taken no dramatic step -- as Committee N proposed -- to permit Chicago "to move with far greater freedom from the U. of I. central administration." Nor has the campus chancellor at Chicago Circle been accorded the kind of on-site leadership potential which Committee N felt was needed. Why, then, my hesitancy in making a blanket statement that Committee N's recommendations have been ignored?

The Board of Trustees, upon recommendation of President Corbally, has divided those responsibilities formerly vested in Lanier's office and placed them in two new vice-presidential offices, the office of Academic Development and Coordination, headed by Barry Munitz; and the Office of Planning and Resource Allocation, headed by Ronald Brady. Whereas, Lanier had maintained his office in Urbana, Munitz and Brady now have offices in Chicago as well as Urbana. Both report that their time is divided about equally between Urbana-Champaign and Chicago, with the edge perhaps going to Chicago, in large measure because of the presence there of the third system campus, the Medical Center. Some Urbana-Champaign faculty members have made known their concern over a perceived emphasis on Chicago matters at the expense of Urbana-Champaign. They attach significance to the fact that both Munitz and Brady now make their homes in the Chicago area.

On the one hand, the shifting location for the operations of high level U of I officers is consistent with the Committee N recommendation to provide on-site leadership in Chicago. On the other hand, the leadership is at the system level, not the campus level, as the committee had urged. Further, in the past three years, there appears to have been a conscious effort on the part of top U of I administrators to develop a higher awareness among the public (and among its internal constituents) of the system character of the institution. This has taken form chiefly of an emphasis on the three-campus operation as an organic university.

Board of Regents and Board of Governors

The detailed attention to both SIU and U of I developments since the submission of the Committee N report in 1971 should not obscure the fact that increasingly complex relationships exist among those institutions governed by the Board of Regents and the Board of Governors.⁴³ Changes have occurred in the headship of one of the systems, and new presidents have come to most of the institutions. Ben Morton, who was new as the Board of

Governors executive officer when Committee N convened, left the position several months ago to become chancellor of the West Virginia Board of Regents. He was succeeded, on an interim basis, by Jerome M. Sachs, former president of Northeastern Illinois State University. Frank Matsler, executive director of the Board of Regents since its creation in the late sixties, remains as the administrator for that board.

The shifts in presidents are likely to be critical when another examination of governance occurs at the statewide level. For instance, at Northern Illinois University, Rhoten Smith, who favored campus boards in 1971, has been succeeded by Richard Nelson. Nelson himself has had experience as a lay board member in Illinois, and he can be expected to possess helpful insights on governance problems facing the state.

Strengthened Position of State Community Colleges

The fifth system within the system of systems is the Illinois Community College Board (formerly the Junior College Board). A set of forces not particularly visible in 1971 now impacts upon the system. Not least of these is the competition between districts for programs. At the September meeting of the BHE, outgoing Director West cited such competition as resembling that which raged most intensely four or five years ago among senior institutions over graduate offerings.

From the standpoint of governance, probably the most significant development within the community college sector since 1971 is the creation of the Illinois Community College Trustee Association. This body maintains an office and full-time staff in Springfield. It is described by some as a lobbying organization which represents the collective interests of the trustees around the state. If the preparation of Master Plan -- Phase IV should involve a serious examination of governance, this association will be a force to be reckoned with. In that sense, it represents an element that was not on the scene when Committee N carried on its deliberations in 1970 and 1971.

Footnotes

1. Letter from Melvin G. Lockard, Secretary, Board of Trustees, Southern Illinois University, to George L. Clements, Chairman, Board of Higher Education, dated January 29, 1970.
2. Cresap, McCormick, and Paget, Inc., "Southern Illinois University: Report on Governance and Administration of the University" (Chicago, June 25, 1970), p. 111-16.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid., p. 111-18.
6. Ibid., p. 111-5.
7. "Consultants' Report Rips SIU Trustees for Ineffectiveness," Chicago Sun-Times, July 9, 1970.
8. Resolution approved by the SIU Board of Trustees, "Establishment of Office of Board Staff, Functions of the Chief of Board Staff, and Authorization of His Principal Assistants," August 3, 1970, p. 1-1.
9. Ibid.
10. Resolution approved by the SIU Board of Trustees, "Resolution Eliminating the Position of President of Southern Illinois University, Declaring a Transitional Period With Respect to Administrative Reorganization, and Creating a University Administrative Council," August 3, 1970, pp. 3-1 to 3-4.
11. Ibid.
12. From a resolution approved by the SIU Board of Trustees, August 20, 1971.
13. Ibid., p. 11.
14. Ibid., pp. 13 and 14.
15. Ibid., p. 13.
16. "Report of the Committee on Board and Executive Officer Relationships," approved by the SIU Board of Trustees, March 9, 1973.
17. "Guidelines for Functions of the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University," in Minutes of the SIU Board of Trustees, March 9, 1973, p. 6.

18. "Creation and Functions of Southern Illinois University System Council," in Minutes of the SIU Board of Trustees, March 9, 1973, p. 11.
19. Ibid., p. 12.
20. Ibid., p. 18.
21. Ibid.
22. "Report of the Committee on Board and Executive Officer Relationships," approved by the SIU Board of Trustees, January 19, 1974.
23. Ibid., p. 8.
24. Ibid., p. 13.
25. "Statement of Committee on Board and Executive Officer Relationships at SIU," distributed at SIU Board of Trustees Meeting, January 19, 1974.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid.
28. "SIU's Derge Steps Down for Faculty Post," Champaign-Urbana Courier, March 14, 1974 (Lindsay-Schaub News Service and Associated Press release).
29. Ibid.
30. "Basic Flaw Remains in SIU System," Editorial, Edwardsville Intelligencer, January 30, 1974.
31. Ibid.
32. Dick Norrish, "Open Hearing Set on SIU Administration," Edwardsville Intelligencer, May 10, 1974.
33. Ibid.
34. "Reshape SIU Administrative Structure," Editorial, Champaign-Urbana Courier, May 14, 1974.
35. Ibid.
36. From the author's notes, taken at the Board of Trustees meeting.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid.
39. From a transcript of the news conference, June 23, 1974.

40. Illinois, Board of Higher Education, Report of Committee N -- Governing Structure (June 1971), p. 41.
41. Ibid., p. 43.
42. Ibid., p. 48.
43. Due to a lack of time and space, I have, regretfully, been unable to explore the critical relationships in the Board of Governors and Board of Regents systems. They will play an important part in any governance discussion in the preparation of Master Plan -- Phase IV.

Chapter VII

IMPACT OF RECENT DEVELOPMENTS ON GOVERNANCE FOR MASTER PLAN--PHASE IV

A large body of literature exists on the topic of Illinois public higher education. Perhaps the most basic source for those studying governance in 1974 is the Report of Committee N--Governance Structure, received by the BHE in 1971, but never discussed by that body. It was, in effect, authored by James C. Worthy, the most knowledgeable person in the state on the origin and early development of the system of systems. It must stand as a "framework" document for those charged with examining governance within the context of Master Plan -- Phase IV.

Events of the past three and one-half years have altered certain aspects of governance. Many of the changes have been political, and students of governance cannot ignore them. This final chapter might be viewed as a supplement to the framework made available to the BHE in the spring of 1971.

When Worthy presented Committee N's report to the BHE, he was transmitting a document to a board headed by a chairman appointed by a Republican governor. This governor, Richard B. Ogilvie, was then well into his third year in office. In November 1972 Ogilvie was defeated in his bid for reelection by Democrat Dan Walker. Shortly after his election, Walker appointed as chairman of the BHE Don Prince, a former educator and one-time candidate for state superintendent of public instruction. As discussed at length above, Cameron West was appointed by the BHE to be its executive director in May of 1973.

Selection of BHE Directors

The 1961 statute creating the BHE clearly states that the governor shall appoint the BHE chairman, but that the board shall select professional staff. Regardless of the facts, the perception among the leaders of the Illinois higher education community was that Governor Walker hand-picked West and that the board ratified the governor's selection.

The same perception existed of the selection of Holderman as BHE executive director in 1969. In West's case the only criticism was that the selection process itself was in conflict with at least the spirit of the law, but with Holderman there were additional irritations. Holderman had been active in Republican party affairs, and some charged that the impropriety of the governor's influence -- if indeed such influence was exerted -- was compounded by Holderman's previous activity in the Republican party.

No attempt is being made here to impugn the motives of Ogilvie, Holderman, Walker or West. Yet the timing of West's resignation -- occurring just as he was announcing the need to include an assessment of governance in Phase IV -- forces a reexamination of any governor's role in the selection of the BHE director.

In West's case, the public relations problems associated with entry of an out-of-state educator into the Illinois system, together with the inexperience of a new governor's staff, may have been partially responsible for the public perception that he was selected by Walker. Newspaper stories throughout the state announced "Walker's appointment" of West, and these articles have haunted West's activities from the very beginning.

For instance, a Chicago morning newspaper carried prominently a photograph of West over the headline, "Walker's Choice for School Post."¹ Those of us who assumed this was the headline writer's error were shocked to read in a short Associated Press news story which followed:

Cameron West, vice president for planning at the University of North Carolina, has been appointed by Gov. Walker as executive director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Cameron [sic] who is to assume the post June 1, succeeds James B. Holderman.²

Fifteen months later, after his resignation late in July 1974, newspapers around the state editorialized that West, a competent administrator, had been limited by the conditions surrounding his appointment. A southern Illinois newspaper put it this way:

But Mr. West has been less of an executive director than his abilities would allow him to be. That is because of the circumstances in which he found, and put, himself.

Higher education in Illinois, especially the budgeting process, is intensely political. Legislators from districts which include major university and community colleges--and practically all districts include one or the other--have a pork barrel view of higher education....

It is impossible for an executive director who is the governor's hand-picked man to function without the interest of the governor in mind.

Mr. West was chosen for his position not by the board which employs him, but by Gov. Daniel Walker.... Mr. Walker did it for a purpose, as Mr. West should have known. Mr. West while he had considerable leeway in his duties, was in the final analysis supposed to keep the universities from giving the governor the type of problems they gave former Gov. Richard Ogilvie.

When the head of the board's staff and the board's chairman are hand-picked by the governor, the so-called professional arena itself can become political...

Whatever the reasons for Mr. West's departure, the next executive director should not be hired in the same manner.³

A Shifting Balance of Power

Governors and BHE executive directors come and go, but colleges and universities in Illinois are lasting enterprises. Perhaps the most significant immediate question is the effect of West's departure on the preparation of Master Plan -- Phase IV.

Public officials and educators generally agree that the 1974 events culminating in West's resignation have weakened the state's higher education structure. A statement by Ivan Elliott, chairman of the SIU Board of Trustees, seems indicative of general attitudes:

It's unfortunate to have a change now.... I think Dr. West got to understand Illinois' problems.

I appreciate his work on the master plan review, but don't think a change now will have any effect because there hasn't been any impact so far.⁴

A majority of individuals conversant on this subject believe that an important shifting of power among state agencies has occurred since the spring of 1971. At that time, cries for accountability and responsibility were being raised in many sectors, and various parts of state government were responding.

The BHE itself has attempted to satisfy its many "publics." In the educational sphere the BHE represents a sixth system within the system of systems. As a coordinating and planning agency, however, it differs from a governing system chiefly in that it has no constituency. It is an educational body without students, faculty, alumni, or a PTA to lobby in its behalf.

Within the family of state agencies, the BHE also lacks either a constituency or a patron. It is now wedged between the governor's Bureau of the Budget (BOB) and legislative committees, increasingly gaining their own expertise through new and competent staff. When all these forces are added up, one can understand something of the pressures to which executive directors have been subjected.

In his characteristically colorful language, Professor Peter Yankwich described the systems of governing boards in 1971:

One of the Boards is doing a reasonable job; two are neuters; and one seems to be in an historical disaster-seeking role.⁵

One need not accept Yankwich's conclusions to understand the way some perceive the shifting of relative strengths of the governing boards within the system of systems. Yankwich's board "in a disaster-seeking role" was probably the SIU Board of Trustees. He exaggerated his point, in my opinion, but indeed within the family of systems, SIU seems to have declined as a force. The "neuters" of which Yankwich writes are the Board of Governors and the Board of

Regents. In my judgement, he is again overstating the case, but many in the Illinois higher education community feel both boards are less influential within the system of systems than they were when Committee N submitted its report. The board doing a "reasonable job" is the U of I Board of Trustees.

The charge could be made that Yankwich's analysis is colored by his long association with the U of I. Yet the assessment is not unlike that of some leaders within the non-U of I systems. There is a persistent feeling that the U of I system and its major administrators are considerably stronger within the state now than in 1971.

Two major concerns appear prominent among non-U of I leaders. These are what they perceive as the growing influence of the BOB, on the one hand, and the U of I, on the other. In contrast to 1971, there is now considerable sentiment in the broad higher education community to strengthen the BHE vis a vis the U of I and the governor's BOB.

Concern over the BOB is based chiefly on the view long held by many educators that central state agencies with little continuity and no specific interest in monitoring higher education tend to overlook the lasting benefits of education in the press of daily political forces. The worry over strengthened U of I influence in statewide affairs seemed to rise from other sources. More than one top institutional administrator outside the U of I system confided that the highly regarded fiscal planning talent within the U of I and its accompanying hardware are so efficiently managed that a BHE staff in disarray stands little chance of regaining the kind of control it exercised during previous BHE administrations. Although some expressed dismay over this apparent condition, the tenor of opinions was that statewide fiscal planning responsibility should not go by default to a single system without statutory authority for such a function. Actually, some officers of other institutions seemed almost to encourage an expanded role for U of I leadership in this area, but they have cautioned that such a step, if taken, should be in the open and perhaps with statutory changes.

At the same time that many advocate strengthening the BHE, sentiment increases in other quarters to eliminate the BHE entirely. For instance, state Sen. Stanley B. Weaver (R-Urbana) declared on July 29 that he would seek legislation to abolish the BHE. In so doing, he would join Rep. John C. Hirschfeld (R-Champaign), who has several times previously expressed the same desire.

Even when the acrimony surrounding Committee N's deliberations was at its highest in 1970 and 1971, there were few who seriously advocated that the General Assembly abolish the BHE. Now several factors have led to such a suggestion by Weaver and others. Among these are the instability produced within the BHE staff by West's short tenure and the departure of several key aides. The perceived influence of Governor Walker over the board and its staff is another critical factor in such an argument.

Governance Alternatives in 1974

Although many educators took issue with the analysis in the 1971 Committee N report and with its final recommendations, I have found no one who argued with the skillful handling by the committee -- chiefly Worthy, as the report's major author -- in presenting every conceivable structural arrangement. The report is a classic in the literature because it offers the full range of organizational options available to the state. Since the report can still be obtained by the public, I shall not review in detail the precise alternative arrangements spelled out there.

Is there any evidence that those most involved in the Committee N investigation have shifted their positions? Chairman Worthy consented to talk with me recently about his ideas, more than three years after submission of the report.

Worthy is among those who now feel the emergence of the BOB as a possible controlling factor in the management of the universities represents a threat to the institutions. His argument against campus boards in 1970-71 resulted from his notion of balance among the elements of the system of systems: to create campus boards would have divided the strong systems and tipped the balance in favor of the BHE. Now, according to Worthy, this is just what the agency needs. Thus, the key figure in the 1970-71 Committee N deliberations now concedes that the campus board idea should be considered again if any serious study of governance is made in the preparation of Master Plan -- Phase IV.

The range of alternatives extends far beyond the present system or campus boards. At the other extreme from campus boards is a single statewide governing board, an option which would eliminate the existing systems and the BHE. In terms of political implementation the most realistic alternative would be a rearrangement involving most of the existing boards.

There has been speculation for many years about a California Model for Illinois. This modification would entail the grouping of the research-oriented campuses into one system, the former state teachers colleges into a second system, and the community or junior colleges in a third system. If such a scheme were ever considered seriously, the problem would be to determine which campuses would fit best into the University of California-type of research-oriented system. The narrative accompanying Master Plan -- Phase III proposed that five campuses be designated as "University Centers," and inclusion of these particular campuses in one level of a three-tier system offers a solution. The campuses were (1) the U of I at Urbana-Champaign, (2) the U of I at Chicago Circle, (3) SIU-Carbondale, (4) Northern Illinois University, and (5) Illinois State University.

It has been noted above that in 1970 the chancellor of the Chicago City Colleges proposed that a broad Chicago City College and University System be created to govern those institutions in the Chicago region. A classic argument against such an arrangement has been that it would polarize political

conflicts long present in relationships between downstate and Chicago. Recently, however, some educators have suggested the consideration of modifications within the system of systems which would cluster those institutions with severe urban problems into a single system. In 1970 Clements, Holderman, and others supported individual campus boards because boards managing both rural types of campuses and urban institutions could not effectively concentrate on the complex problems faced in larger cities.

A few university executives with whom I have talked feel a review of governance proposed in the preparation of Master Plan -- Phase IV should at least consider the possibilities of creation of an "urban university system." While making it clear he is not advocating such a plan, former Northeastern Illinois State President Jerome Sachs has suggested that such an option be among the alternatives studied if governance should again become the subject of serious investigation. Sachs, presently serving as interim executive officer of the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities, speaks from an unusual perspective, having been the president of an urban institution for several years and now serving a board with governance authority over some campuses in nonurban areas.

At this writing there is no consensus emerging on any governance modifications. Unless support should be mounted in either the legislature or the executive branch, it would not seem likely that governance will be a pressing consideration in the preparation of MP-IV.

Need for Deliberate Procedure

Shortly after Committee N held its final meeting in February of 1971, Professor Yankwich declared that "a study of the university governance systems in Illinois should have been undertaken and completed during the early stages of MP-III instead of near its end."⁶ He continued:

Instead, Committee N was hooked immediately by the Chicago Circle Problem and never got beyond it except to tinker with the system for electing members of the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois.⁷

Yankwich's retrospective observation in regard to the timing of the 1970-71 governance study merits attention now, as early discussions of Phase IV are moving forward. No one had any idea that controversy would so totally surround Committee N's deliberations on governance, and it is important to draw a lesson from that long and exhausting experience. I am among those who believe a more effective arrangement could be found for governing Illinois institutions of public higher education, and all the evidence seems to support a most thorough study by all affected sectors in the early stages of preparation of Phase IV.

It is surprising that so few members of the Illinois college and university community are educated to the complexities of the governing of public higher educations, an area which directly affects them. Yet more faculty and administrators are aware of the structural dynamics than they were three years ago, due, no doubt, to the problems accompanying economic retrenchment.

It is to be hoped that the universe of individuals knowledgeable in the area can be enlarged even more in the months ahead. Benefits of such an expansion would extend far beyond the completion of Phase IV of the Master Plan.

Hopefully, the time will never come in Illinois higher education -- or elsewhere in the United States -- when emotions produced by economic and political tensions will gain precedence over rationality. Yet we cannot ignore indicators which point towards an increasing statewide politicization of public higher education, resulting chiefly from an apparent scarcity of funds. No better insurance against succumbing to these emotional responses is available than a renewed commitment by a large number of educators, state officials, and political leaders to seek a real understanding of this extremely complex but very precious sector which touches so critically both our public and private lives.

Footnotes

1. Chicago Sun-Times, April 17, 1973.
2. Ibid.
3. Editorial, Southern Illinoisan, July 25, 1974.
4. By-lined news story by Dave Butler, Southern Illinoisan, July 23, 1974.
5. Peter Yankwich, "Remarks Prepared for a Public Hearing on the Initial Draft -- Phase III." University of Illinois Assembly Hall, March 9, 1971, p. 7.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.

APPENDICES

A.	Committee N Charge, 1965	97
B.	Questions for Consideration, September 1, 1970	99
C.	Letter from Committee N Chairman, September 8, 1970	101
D.	Letter from Committee N Chairman, October 9, 1970	103
E.	Chicago Circle Resolution, December 28, 1970	107

APPENDIX A

COMMITTEE IN CHARGE, 1965

STATE OF ILLINOIS
BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Master Plan Phase II
1965

COMMITTEE IN CHARGE

1. Should there be any realignment of state-supported institutions within the governing structure which currently prevails in Illinois? If so, what changes are recommended?
2. What is the effective span of control of a governing board over senior institutions?

Can a governing Board effectively control more than one institution?

If so, how many and under what conditions?

3. What factors should be considered in assigning a newly organized institution to the jurisdiction of a governing board?
 - A. Its similarity in programs and services to other institutions under the governing board?
 - B. Its proximity to other institutions controlled by the Board?
 - C. The capabilities of the board in relation to the size of the system it governs?
 - D. Others?
4. To what extent and under what conditions, if any, should institutions develop branch campuses?

When, if ever, should branch campuses become "free-standing" institutions within a system?
5. Under what conditions should an institution within a system be given its own governing board?
6. If it appears proper for each institution to have a separate governing board, should each campus under that institution report directly to the board or be under some central administration and planning structure of the governing board?

7. If institutions and/or governing boards increase in future years, what inter-institutional or inter-board organizations are recommended to realize beneficial cooperation and effective coordination?

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

September 1, 1970

STATE OF ILLINOIS
BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Master Plan - Phase III
1970

Committee N
Questions for Consideration
(As reformulated September 1, 1970)

1. As the Board of Higher Education nears the completion of its first decade of existence, how effective has it been in fulfilling its original charge, as defined by statute?
2. Is the present legislation under which the Board of Higher Education functions adequate?
3. Under present or new legislation what should be the appropriate mission of the Board of Higher Education?
4. Are earlier definitions of the coordinating, governance, and administrative functions in Illinois higher education adequate? If not, how might they be clarified?
5. Dependent upon the response to the above question, what are appropriate relationships between the following:
 - a. Board of Higher Education and governing boards, systems and institutions;
 - b. Faculty and student groups and Board of Higher Education, governing boards and institutional administrations;
 - c. Board of Higher Education and its staff; governing boards and their staffs; institutions and their staffs;
 - d. Staff of Board of Higher Education and other branches of government;
 - e. Board of Higher Education and other branches of State government (governor, including Bureau of the Budget; General Assembly);
 - f. Federal agencies and Board of Higher Education, governing boards and systems or institutions.

6. Are earlier systems of "typology" adequate for the present? If not, what more effective systems should be devised?
7. Is a realignment of state-supported institutions within the governing structure which prevails desirable? If so, what changes are to be recommended?
8. What factors should be considered in assignment of an existing institution or a newly organized institution to the jurisdiction of a governing board?
 - a. Its similarity in programs and services to other institutions under the governing board?
 - b. Its proximity to other institutions controlled by the Board?
 - c. The capabilities of its board in relation to the size of the system it governs?
 - d. Others?
9. Is the concept of an "educationally autonomous" institution helpful in the management of Illinois public higher education? If so, is the concept accurately defined and understood?
10. Is it likely that the period 1970-80 will require reorganization of coordinating and/or governing boards beyond that already covered in earlier questions? If so, what patterns are recommended, both for short-run and long-run considerations?

APPENDIX C

LETTER FROM COMMITTEE N CHAIRMAN, SEPTEMBER 8, 1970

I have been asked by Mr. George L. Clements, Chairman of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, to chair a reconstituted "Committee N" on governance of public higher education in Illinois.

The initial meeting of the Committee, a roster of which is enclosed, was held on August 29, 1970. Also enclosed is a list of questions to which the Committee has been asked to direct its attention.

At its first meeting, Committee N members agreed that early counsel from the various sectors of Illinois higher education is essential if its ambitious task is to be accomplished. Hence, I was directed by the Committee to solicit such a response from governing boards, institutional administrations, the faculty, students, non-academic personnel, and other sectors of your system or campus that might wish to place their views before the Committee.

We are particularly desirous of responses representing a broad spectrum of opinions on the questions we must attempt to answer. To aid in obtaining such opinions, we ask that you distribute copies of this letter, including the questions enclosed, to those organizational entities and individuals in your system or institution in such manner as in your judgment will elicit the broadest and most effective response, including publication in student newspapers and faculty bulletins, should you so wish.

The Board of Higher Education has requested that Committee N complete its work and submit its recommendations no later than January 1, 1971. To meet this schedule and to give the Committee time to review and consider the responses from the various institutions and systems in the preparation of its final report, it will be necessary for us to receive such materials no later than October 15, 1970.

We would appreciate your own personal counsel and advice on all questions listed in the enclosure in respect to which you have a point of view you wish to have considered. We are especially interested in learning your views on issues directly relevant to the position you personally hold in the educational system.

While we welcome official statements representing the official views of your board, system, campus, or organizations, we also seek individual opinions. Leadership in the systems and institutions should determine whether responses represent individual views of members of the academic community or are submitted as "official" position statements.

We hope, of course, that we may receive the benefit of candid opinions of the the various sectors of the higher education community. Therefore, we shall

guarantee the confidentiality of any section of a statement or an entire statement submitted with the request that it remain confidential within our Committee.

We ask that each statement submitted be covered by a one-page summary, entitled "Summary of Recommendations to Committee N," and including the following information: 1) name of individual or group making the statement; 2) status of the statement (i.e., individual opinion or official position for a system, institution, campus, faculty or student groups, etc.); and 3) confidentiality of the statement.

The Committee will examine every response carefully. It is urged that each written response include a complete statement of all the material the respondent wishes the Committee to consider, because in most instances this will be the only means available for communicating with the Committee.

In instances where the Committee feels there is reason to seek clarification of points raised by respondents, or where there may be special questions the Committee wishes to address to particular persons, such individuals may be invited to meet with the Committee. These persons (who must necessarily be limited in number) will be notified as early as possible by telegram of the place and date of the pertinent meeting.

The Board of Higher Education, of course, will hold public hearings later regarding the total Master Plan III package, which will include those recommendations of Committee N which have been accepted by the Board.

We look forward to hearing from you personally and from other interested parties in your system or institution. I trust, in keeping with Board of Higher Education policy, that this correspondence, mailed to all governing board chairmen and chief executive officers of systems and campuses, will represent our only contact with the various components of the public higher education community. However, in view of the nature of the request, respondents should feel free to submit statements directly to us or through your office, if the format specified above is followed.

The Board of Higher Education joins me and other members of Committee N in expressing our appreciation for your assistance in assuring the fullest participation of all sectors of the higher education community in this important endeavor.

Sincerely,

James C. Worthy
Chairman
Committee N

Enclosures:

- 1) Membership, Committee N
- 2) Questions for Consideration

APPENDIX D

LETTER FROM COMMITTEE N CHAIRMAN, OCTOBER 9, 1970

Letter sent to: Governing board chairman, System Heads,
Senior Institution presidents

Dear:

The enclosed document outlines major considerations before Master Plan Committee N. Since certain of these alternatives will effect significant changes in current governing structures for public higher education in Illinois, we solicit the views toward these alternative of those officials and official bodies most directly affected. Since the Committee is working under strict time constraints, we hope these views might be incorporated into those statements due on October 15. At the latest, the Committee must receive any supplemental statement regarding these particular alternatives before October 29, 1970.

Sincerely,

James C. Worthy
Chairman, Committee N

Enclosure

MAJOR ALTERNATIVES BEFORE

COMMITTEE "N"

During the first four meetings of Committee N, the Committee has heard presentations from Mr. Sherman Rosen of Cresap, McCormick and Paget, Inc., Dr. Ernest Palola of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley, and Mr. George L. Clements, Chairman, Board of Higher Education. These presentations have sparked extensive discussion among Committee members. Emerging from these presentations and discussions are four major alternatives which the Committee is carefully considering: 1) making no change from the current "system of systems"; 2) rearranging the current system of systems; 3) creating an institutional governing board for each campus as well as a regional structure to promote interinstitutional cooperation among public and private institutions; and 4) creating an evolutionary, experimental governing structure which retains aspects of the "system of systems" structure, creates individual boards for certain institutions, and builds in an experimental regional structure to encourage public-private cooperation. The latter three are outlined in general below. We seek the response of the higher education community to these alternatives:

I. Rearrangement of the Systems of Systems. The current system could be rearranged in order to attain greater uniformity by program and mission typology and by geographical location. The following is one possible realignment toward these ends:

A. Metropolitan Universities: Chicago State College, Governors State University, and Northeastern Illinois State College.

- uniformity of current and planned program offerings
(all master level work)
- all located in Chicago Metropolitan Area
- all commuter institutions of similar size

B. Northern Illinois Universities: Northern Illinois University and University of Illinois at Chicago Circle.

- program offerings at similar stage of development
- both located in Northern tier of the state
- comparable size

C. Central Illinois Universities: Illinois State University, Western Illinois University, Eastern Illinois University, and Sangamon State University.

- similarity in program offerings
- located in central region of state

- D. Southern Illinois Universities: Southern Illinois University at Carbondale and Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville.

--uniform program typology does not apply
--located in Southern region of the state

- E. The University of Illinois. (with Champaign-Urbana and Medical Center campuses).

--the one comprehensive, graduate education, research-oriented public university in the state with a program offering that cannot be compared to that of any other state institution.

II. Institutional Governing Boards for Each Campus. This alternative, which represents a significant departure from existing governing structures, would create a governing board for each individual campus. A statewide planning and coordinating board would be maintained. Also, the essential functions of governance and coordination as currently defined by statute and as presently practiced would continue. The rationale for this structural change is as follows: it is felt that with one institution under its jurisdiction a board and each of its members could become closer to and more intimately aware of an institution, its special problems and needs. Consequently, a board could take a more active and informed role in interpreting an institution to its public constituents and public constituents to their institution. Further, the single campus board removes a layering of structure and provides the various segments of the campus community with a clearer conception of where decisions are made, as well as easier access to the points of decision.

It is also felt that there is a definite need to strengthen the role of the chief executive officer on each campus. While a plethora of forces have in recent years eroded the influence of the chief executive over his institution, top quality leadership is required if an institution is to be given direction and is to cope with the new and changing environment of higher education. With a board for each campus, the chief executive officer of that campus would have direct and immediate access to decision and a direct source of support to rely upon in times of stress.

Within this governing framework, regional advisory councils would be created to promote the cooperative sharing of resources, facilities, and programs among institutions, public and private, junior and senior, within geographic regions of the state. The functions of these regional councils would be: 1) to recommend to the statewide coordinating board funding for cooperative programs or facilities; and 2) to assume governing responsibility for such cooperative programs. (These functions roughly follow the model of Quad-Cities Graduate Center which is a cooperative program among numerous Illinois and Iowa institutions offering graduate education in the Quad-Cities area). These councils could possibly be composed of the chief executive officers of each campus within a particular region. Potential arenas for cooperation

among institutions within regions are:

1. Distinguished Professorship with lectures at all campuses.
2. Faculty Rotation Plan for Academic Terms.
3. Part-time Faculty among cooperating colleges.
4. Inter-Library Loan Plan.
5. Audio-Visual Pool and Closed Circuit Television.
6. Inter-Collegiate Class Attendance Privileges.
7. Inter-Campus Special Events.
8. Major Facilities Sharing.
9. Inter-Campus Transportation.
10. Inter-Collegiate Tours Abroad.
11. Community Cultural and Enrichment Program.
12. Married Student Village.
13. Central Inter-Campus Health Clinic.
14. Joint Purchase and Use of Scientific Equipment.
15. Student Teacher Practice Training Placement.
16. Common Student Health and Accident Insurance.
17. Common Faculty-Staff Insurance.
18. Cooperative Purchasing.
19. Cooperative Graduate Programs.
20. Trustee Seminars and Education.
21. Computer and Data Processing.
22. Contractural Interchange for Program Offerings.

III. Evolutionary Systems, Institutional, and Experimental Structures for Governance. The last alternative would be an evolutionary governing structure which attempts to capture the advantages of I and II (outlined above). This alternative would have three basic components:

- A. Retention of Two Reorganized Governing Board Systems:
 1. Metropolitan Universities: Chicago State College, Governors State University, and Northeastern Illinois State College.
 2. Central Illinois Universities: Illinois State University, Western Illinois University, Eastern Illinois University, and Sangamon State University.
- B. Creation of Institutional Governing Boards for each of the following campuses:
 1. The Northern Illinois University
 2. University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
 3. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
 4. Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
 5. University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana
- C. Initiation on an experimental basis of the regional advisory council structure (outlined above) in certain select regions which have institutions with individual governing boards.

APPENDIX E

CHICAGO CIRCLE RESOLUTION, DECEMBER 28, 1970

Excerpt from Minutes of Meeting
Committee N on Governance
Board of Higher Education

December 28, 1970
Chicago, Illinois

The following is an excerpt from the minutes of a meeting of the Board of Higher Education's Committee N on Governance, held December 28, 1970.

Dr. Cole introduced the following resolution to be acted upon as a motion:

Committee N is already on record as to its conviction that the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle should be one of the outstanding centers of higher education in the country. It had tentatively reached the conclusion that this could best be accomplished by giving the Chicago Circle Campus, together with the Medical Center Campus, its own governing board. This proposal has evoked strong opposition from the President of the University of Illinois as well as from the Chancellors of the three campuses who have been supported by resolutions from their faculty senates.

Thus far, Committee N has heard no testimony from individuals or groups within the University who favor the proposal for separation, though we have received evidence that such sentiment does exist. There are allegations that opposition to the official University position has been silenced by threats of reprisal.

Yet in the absence of strong support for autonomy for the Chicago Circle Campus and the Medical Center Campus from those most immediately concerned, the Committee is reluctant to make such a recommendation.

I therefore move that the staff be instructed to seek out from the faculties, students, and staffs of the Chicago Circle Campus and the Medical Center Campus and from the community those persons who favor autonomy from the central University administration and solicit their testimony before this committee and that at the same time the staff should explore ways and means to protect those individuals from any reprisals should such a danger in fact be present.

The motion was seconded by Judge Kerner.

During discussion on the motion several Committee members sought and received from Dr. Cole and Judge Kerner interpretations of its content. Among these was Mr. Berry, who asked if the motion would clearly make it possible for all groups of people, particularly those in the community and not directly attached to the University, to be heard. It was agreed that such was the intent of the motion.

Judge Stengel moved that the motion be amended to direct the staff "to have research done on the legal problems" associated with separate boards for the existing University of Illinois campuses and "to contact legal counsel at both Chicago Circle and Urbana" for exploration of this matter. Dr. Cole and Judge Kerner agreed to this amendment to their motion.

The chairman asked for a vote on the motion: the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion with the chair not voting.

7200-019
5-18
B C-T

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
378 .1K251Q C001
GOVERNANCE OF ILLINOIS HIGHER EDUCATION.



3 0112 025306173